OVERCOMING "STIGMA":
IMPORTANT INGREDIENTS FOR IMMIGRANT INTEGRATION

Report Stemming from the
Migration Learning Community

Migration Policy Institute
1 November 2007

Presented to:

The Atlantic Philanthropies

Contents

I. Introduction

This report stems from the discussions held under Migration Learning Community (MLC) initiative that took place in September 2006. Sponsored by The Atlantic Philanthropies, this project brought together immigrant community activists, foundations and other policy practitioners in a European tour that took place in Brussels, Berlin and London. The tour consisted of a range of roundtables, political briefings and a number of site visits across the three cities.

The MLC deliberated many pressing immigration issues ranging from the role of government in assisting ethnic community-based organizations to strengthening immigrant communities and strategies to handle illegal immigration to the evolving nature of citizenship and Islam in Europe.

Part One of this report addresses three major topics that emerged "organically" from the tour:

- Ethnic and Community-Based Organizations
- Faith and Immigration
- Illegal Immigration

While there was no overarching theme of the tour, the key discussions revolved around the "building blocks" or "ingredients" of immigrant integration and how immigrant integration could be promoted by practitioners and policymakers.

Part One first provides some background on immigration and integration and then goes on to discuss, briefly, some of the learning points that participants felt were crucial to understanding the varying migration systems and policies of countries. The report then discusses three of the major topics that arose during the course of the tour in more detail.

It is clear that there are challenges common to both the United States and Europe. At least two trends emerged as particularly important. The first – *high sustained flows* – has become well known. Nearly one in eight people in the United States today are foreign born. One in five children in the United States, and more than one in four low-income children, is the child of an immigrant. Over half of new workers in the 1990s were immigrants, and the foreign born compose very high shares of some occupations, accounting for one in five doctors in the United States, for example. Similarly, in Europe, despite short-term fluctuations, net migration levels since 1960 have continued upwards. In fact, immigration now accounts for the vast majority of population growth in Europe: 80 percent between 2000 and 2005, and 84 percent between 2005 and 2006.

High flows mean that the success of the nation as a whole and of its institutions will increasingly depend on the contributions and integration of immigrants. This will affect the United States and the countries of Europe in broadly similar ways.

The second major trend we identify is that of *less concentrated flows*. In the United States, the immigrant population has historically been concentrated in six large receiving states. However, a whole new set of gateway states has rapidly emerged as immigration spreads out. The migrants in the flows to new gateway states (such as North Carolina) are more recently arrived, poorer, younger, less educated, and more likely to be undocumented than immigrants nationally. Limited community resources, institutional infrastructure, and experience may all present barriers to integration. At the same time, new opportunities and successes may emerge. Similarly, in Europe, immigrant flows are becoming less concentrated, with immigrants moving into suburbs of cities or to new areas of immigration, partly because of settlement and dispersal policies.

The combination of the two trends is proving a test for integration policies on both sides of the Atlantic.

The policy themes explored in Part One of this report leads directly to Part Two, which outlines some of the lessons learned from the Migration Learning Community and the ways that learning from the tour could be developed in the future. Part Two also outlines some of the key challenges ahead.

The report is grounded by two annexes. Annex A is a written summary of the tour, which sets out an edited transcript of each presentation and an abbreviated set of "key points" that emerged from each of the discussions. We have deliberately edited the transcript of each session to provide a readable account of the presentations and deliberations of participants in the Migration Learning Community. Annex B is a list of participants.

PART ONE: POLICY THEMES

II. Background: Immigration and Integration Policy in the United States and Europe

The European Union (EU)[1] and the United States are home to large and growing immigrant communities. Foreign-born residents constitute approximately 8.3 percent of the total EU-27 population (40.5 million) and 12.4 percent of the US population (37.6 million). Such numbers mark (or approach) historic highs, and are likely to keep rising in the coming decades.

Table 1: Foreign-Born Populations in the EU and USA[2]

	EU-27 (2006)[3]	**United States (2006)**[4]
Total population	491 million	299 million
Foreign-born population	40.5 million (8.3%)	37.5 million (12.5%)
Third-country nationals	27.3 million (5.6%)	N/A

For years, Europeans have debated, supported and contested immigration. No single country, however, has succeeded in quelling (often unsubstantiated) fears of immigration. As Tariq Ramadan pointed out during the tour, a sense of fear about alien elements penetrating Europe's identity and mutual mistrust has proliferated across many countries. A recent Pew Global Attitudes poll, released in October 2007, disclosed that in all of the nine surveyed EU Member States, over half of the respondents agreed that their country should further restrict and control immigration. (In Italy and Spain, that figure reached 87 percent and 77 percent respectively). This fear is particularly acute with regard to Muslim immigrants. In August 2007, a Financial Times/Harris Poll showed that 30 percent of Italians and 28 percent of Germans believe the presence of Muslims in their countries poses a threat to national security.[5]

Immigration to the United States has been a bedrock phenomenon. From the second half of the 20th century, and in the early years of the 21st century, immigration has also become a major factor in the formation of national identity in European countries. Many

[1] The European Union comprises 27 states, following the accession of Romania and Bulgaria in January 2007. The figures cited in this table are from 2006 and therefore refer to the 25 states that then made up the European Union.
[2] Comparisons between numbers for the EU-27 and the United States are difficult to make as they use different calculation methods. They do, however, provide an indication of the sizes and proportions.
[3] Rainer Münz, "Aging and Demographic Change in European Societies: Main Trends and Alternative Policy Options," World Bank SP Discussion Paper (Hamburg: Hamburgisches WeltWirtschafts Institute, 2007), http://siteresources.worldbank.org/SOCIALPROTECTION/Resources/SP-Discussion-papers/Labor-Market-DP/0703.pdf.
[4] US Census Bureau, "B05001. Citizenship Status in the United States," 2006 American Community Survey, http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DTTable?_bm=y&-ds_name=ACS_2006_EST_G00_&-CONTEXT=dt&-mt_name=ACS_2006_EST_G2000_B05001&-redoLog=false&-geo_id=01000US&-format=&-_lang=en&-SubjectID=14829037
[5] It should be noted that these polls tend to ask about Muslims, and not just Muslim immigrants.

times during the tour, participants would comment on immigration as a *mutual process*. The growing numbers of immigrants entering the world's leading economies can be explained in part by immigrants' desires to seek a better life abroad or to escape man-made or natural disasters, either temporarily or permanently, and by countries' economic, demographic, and social needs.

Indeed, many of the world's leading economies regard immigration as an inevitable and necessary phenomenon—both for economic and social reasons. As such, governments understand the imperative to successfully integrate immigrants into the economic and social fabric of their societies. Whether temporary or permanent, skilled or unskilled, immigrants need to be integrated as active members of their countries of destination.

This report stemmed from a learning exchange of experts and practitioners from the United States to Berlin, Brussels and London, itself following an earlier tour of European experts and practitioners to Chicago (together we describe this group as the Migration Learning Community). The Migration Learning Community discussed many of the key issues associated with immigration in the world today, and this report attempts to provide a flavor of those debates. Before exploring some of the ideas, best practices, and strategies discussed by participants, the following sets out the "contours" of immigrant integration policy in the United States and in Europe, in order that they can be placed in context.

Immigrant Integration in the United States[6]

The key starting point of immigrant integration in the United States is a "hands-off" government role (though with strong laws promoting equal opportunity) and the central position of work. The federal government plays a comparatively minimal role in the integration of immigrants. Today, as throughout US history, the integration of immigrants has fallen in large part to the labor market. In sharp contrast to most European countries, the US labor market has been open to immigrants, an openness that is reinforced by the reach and maturity of US antidiscrimination laws.

The combined legacy of antidiscrimination and easy access to the labor market has resulted in very high levels of immigrant employment, and immigrants are overrepresented in the overall labor market and among recent hires. Today, immigrants are one in eight US residents, almost one in seven workers, one in five low-wage workers,[7] and about half of low-skilled workers[8] in the United States.[9]

Beyond open access to the labor market, the United States makes available to all immigrants, largely independent of their legal status, a set of fundamental rights. Such rights can be seen as a fundamental form of integration into the US constitutional system.

---

[6] This section of the report draws extensively on a recent MPI volume, *Securing the Future*, edited by Michael Fix.
[7] Low-wage workers earned less than twice the federal minimum wage in 2004.
[8] Low-skilled workers are those with less than a high school education.
[9] Urban Institute's calculations from the 2005 Current Population Survey.

This is not to say, however, that there are no federal services. There are grant and service programs expressly targeted to immigrants and their families or to groups that are largely composed of immigrants. The four major categories include:

- *Refugee placement and settlement programs*. These programs specifically focus on the integration of refugees into new communities. Refugees make up roughly 5 percent of annual legal immigration flows to the United States.
- *Programs serving migrant workers and their families*. While these programs initially may have been designed to meet the needs of US-born migrant workers in agriculture, today almost four out of five farm workers are foreign born. These programs in the areas of health, Head Start, K-12 education, and job training, then, have been transformed into de facto integration policies serving a largely foreign-born work force and their families.
- *Funding streams set aside for language instruction and the promotion of citizenship*. These funding mechanisms promote English language acquisition among limited English proficient (LEP) children (Title III of the No Child Left Behind Act) and adults (the Adult Basic Education/English as a Second Language (ESL) expenditures). They also support the US Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) Office of Citizenship, which encourages naturalization through public education and outreach.
- *Funding provided to communities to offset immigrants' impacts*. This federal funding helps (a) schools meet the additional costs of teaching recently arrived immigrant students; (b) hospitals offset the costs of unauthorized immigrants' uncompensated care; and (c) state and local governments pay the costs of keeping unauthorized and other immigrants in jail

Such targeted spending is dwarfed, however, by spending on mainstream social and education programs like aid programs for economically disadvantaged students. Among other things, total federal spending on immigrants and their families is driven by the creation of new social welfare programs (the State Child Health Insurance Program, for example); shifts in funding to programs used by immigrants (for example, broad increases in Head Start enrollment over the past decade); and changes in program eligibility that affect all recipients, not just immigrants.

While immigrants' and noncitizens' access to basic constitutional protections is broad, no such right appears to hold for public benefits. In the US immigration system, a "sponsor" is the relative or employer who petitions for an immigrant's entry into the United States. Sponsors must financially support the immigrant until he or she naturalizes or can show 40 quarters of work in the United States. Immigrants' eligibility for benefits ranging from those that are means tested (welfare) to social insurance programs (Social Security) has basically been determined by where immigrants fall on what might be termed a "continuum of consent," that is, the degree to which the government has consented to their presence in the United States. Undocumented immigrants are eligible for few benefits beyond emergency Medicaid, for example. Legal permanent immigrants' eligibility is determined by the length of their stay in the United States and their

participation in the workforce and military. Refugees have been eligible for benefits on more or less the same terms as citizens.

One byproduct of these restrictions has been that citizenship has become more valuable. Citizenship now stands as the gateway to the social safety net and to residential security (that is, the means to protect oneself against deportation). Compared to many countries, citizenship has been comparatively easy to obtain in the United States. It can be secured reasonably quickly (within five years of becoming a lawful permanent resident (LPR), three if married to a citizen or having served in the military) with modest English-language requirements and a testing process.

Changes in the law have meant that citizenship may be shifting as a marker of integration. On the one hand, citizenship can open access to health insurance and training programs — benefits that may accelerate integration. On the other hand, decisions to naturalize may derive to a greater extent from practical choices on the part of applicants and less from a sense of belonging and national loyalty.

Immigrant Integration in the European Union

The starting point of immigrant integration in the European Union (EU) is not a specific policy but the obvious fact that the EU is made up of 27 countries (25 at the time of the tour), all with differing histories, systems and policies. In fact, on one account, the European Union is arguably a successful enterprise of immigrant integration as a generation ago, most immigrants living in the then European Community were southern Europeans. Today, southern Europe is a part of the Union, its citizens no longer perceived as immigrants. Likewise, eastern Europeans are now full EU members.

The European Union's mandate or "competence" over integration policies is nebulous, its legal basis uncertain. This uncertainty is compounded by divisions of competence within the European Commission itself. The Directorate General for Justice, Liberty and Security is limited to integration policies for third-country nationals (creating a division between EU and non-EU citizens settling into a new country), and many of its integration instruments are explicitly focused on new arrivals. Meanwhile, the Directorate General for Employment and Social Affairs is pursuing a number of migrant-related policies within its broader strategy of social inclusion, social protection and anti-discrimination policies for migrants (including second and third generation migrants).

The EU's role in immigrant integration can be separated into three parts: legal, financial and parameter-setting. It has had a limited legal role. For example, Member States adopted a package of anti-discrimination directives in 2000, designed to eliminate inequalities on a number of grounds, including gender, age and race. Second, it has had a financial role, setting aside a significant budget aimed at immigrant integration. This has been confirmed with the recent adoption of the European Integration Fund. The most substantial achievement – and the centrepiece for the new common agenda – has been in parameter-setting, namely the adoption of eleven Common Basic Principles (CBPs). The CBPs were adopted in 2004 to "underpin a coherent framework on integration of third-

country nationals."[10] These normative principles outline the priorities which should be addressed by any integration policy, including employment, education and access to services. Other concrete outcomes of the EU's remit in integration include the creation of the National Contact Points on Integration and the annual Handbook on Integration.

The integration policies of the EU and the United States are hence not directly comparable as the EU represents a supranational organization rather than a single country. The EU is essentially a set of countries with (mostly) their own integration mandates, albeit with some investments and harmonization at the EU level.

This brief overview of policies in Europe and the United States sketches out the landscape of immigrant integration. It of course stresses breadth over depth, leaving out much of the detail. However, one of the ongoing themes of the learning exchange was a consistent attention by participants to the fundamental differences between the various European and American approaches. We now turn to a summary of the key differences as understood by the Migration Learning Community.

[10] For a critique on the Common Basic Principles, see EPC Issue Paper 27, *Beyond the Common Basic Principles on Integration: the Next Steps*, April 2005, available at http://www.theepc.be

III. Immigration and Integration Differences in the Transatlantic Context

In understanding the exchange, replication, and duplication of best practices, it is essential to understand the "drivers" of a particular political and policy environment. These may be unique funding or regulatory environments, different systems of advocacy and participation, or simply differences between cultures. Superficial similarities and language or other barriers may make it difficult to unpick acute variations in how countries frame immigration.

The following are six key transatlantic differences synthesized from the observations and expert views of those presenting and participating in the tour. They are essential to an understanding of how immigration policies are framed:

1. First, the understanding and definition of "immigrant" is different across countries. In European countries (and particularly Continental Europe), immigrants may include second, third and even fourth generations. In the US, they are restricted to first (and on occasions) second generations.

2. Second, while immigration has always been a fundamental and historical part of the United States, many European Member States such as Ireland, Spain and Italy have only recently become, or recognized themselves as, countries of immigration.

3. Third, immigrant integration in the United States primarily focuses on becoming employed so that individuals can actively contribute to the economy. Employment rates among immigrants are significantly higher in the United States than they are in Europe, though they are strikingly low among certain groups.

4. Fourth, the welfare systems of Europe writ broadly (and including, for instance, universal health coverage) cover a higher proportion of the immigrant population than in the United States.

5. Fifth, when it comes to immigration, the policy and political governance structures differ between the United States and Europe. As one tour participant noted, "It took over thirty years to create a European common market; and so developing a migration policy will take time," the expansion of EU competencies in the economic, political and social realms has ushered in a new era of governance. While the United States maintains firm control over all aspects of its immigration policies, EU Member States are beginning to contemplate areas in which they will share responsibilities in migration management with the EU.

6. Finally, in Europe—where civil society is less mature and foundations play a smaller role than in the United States—governments involve themselves much more in immigrant integration. This does not mean that immigrants are more integrated in Europe, but rather that the state (national, regional or local governments) plays a larger role than in the United States.

These six broad differences immediately highlight the challenges in considering immigration and immigrant integration in a transatlantic context. However, immigrant integration projects and practices across countries can nevertheless provide important lessons as they can have relevance in the national and even transatlantic space.

It is within this context that this report addresses three of the immigrant integration-related themes. All three issues find themselves at the heart of national immigration debates, each playing a critical role in shaping public opinion.

IV. Ethnic and Community-Based Organizations

Immigrants should be viewed as actors, socially, economically, and politically.
- Jan Niessen, Migration Policy Group

In measuring the social capital and civic participation of migrants, it is important to examine both their economic and political situation.
- Thierry Kochuyt

Concerns

Ethnic and community-based organizations sometimes viewed as inward looking entities that shun interaction with the larger society. Studies have shown that ethnic organizations can help energize ethnic enclaves that experience economic difficulties due to their detachment from mainstream economies. The riots that erupted in the suburbs of Paris during the fall of 2005 attest to how the economic marginalization of young immigrant communities can breed powder kegs. That many of these communities experience unemployment rates of over 20 percent, or even 30 percent, does not help them project a positive image to the rest of society.[11]

Part of the explanation for this is that the European labor markets are much more closed than the United States, but regardless, this is fertile ground for right-wing demagoguery.
- Joshua Hoyt, ICIRR

They are not looking for social welfare. They are looking for opportunity.
- Barbara John

Ethnically concentrated communities have become the focus of many debates on multiculturalism and integration. The development of parallel communities over time has led some integration experts to question multicultural model of integration. Instead, policymakers there and across Europe have begun to adopt a more assimilationist line where common values, common languages, and a common understanding of the functioning of democratic societies have taken the front seat in policy formulation. In the United Kingdom, such debates have been particularly pointed, a fact well brought out by presentations and panel members during the tour's visit to Praxis.

The ever more rigorous residency and citizenship requirements, not to mention the introduction of citizenship tests, as well as the toughening stance on family immigration and asylum policies across Europe and in the United States are proof of this narrowing conceptualization of integration.

[11] Bernard Salanié, "The Riots in France: An Economist's View," Social Science Research Council, June 11, 2006, http://riotsfrance.ssrc.org/Salanie/.

Looking Ahead

Ethnic community-based organizations are playing an increasingly important role in assisting newly arrived and established immigrants in adjusting to their new societies. Many are established by refugees, and estimates of the scale of the sector are always likely to be underestimates given the number of those that operate as unregistered or informal entities.

The Migration Learning Community saw the value of these organizations in serving as a gateway to the newly arriving communities, and the growth in capacity and leadership of these organizations as increasingly instrumental to the integration of migrant communities. Some governments are increasingly taking the same view, and there was a clear sense of transatlantic potential in developing this policy area.

Spotlight: CASA de Maryland

CASA of Maryland is a community organization that was founded in 1985 by Central American refugees and North Americans. CASA was created in response to the human needs of the thousands of Central Americans arriving to the Washington, DC area after fleeing wars and civil strife in their countries of origin. While CASA was established to meet the special needs of the Central American population, it serves immigrants from virtually every country in Latin America, as well as Africans, Asians and US citizens, as needed.

CASA provides a range of activities that address the conditions of poverty affecting many Latino, Asian and African immigrants in the metropolitan Washington area and throughout the state of Maryland. CASA strives to facilitate the self-development of the Latino and immigrant community to gain full participation in the larger society through programs in employment, education, community organizing, legal services, social services, and health promotion.

CASA operates workers' centers, where workers take on leadership roles in determining the Center regulations, as well as salary scales to avoid underbidding; and employers are matched with pre-screened workers to meet their needs. These Centers also offer classes and training for workers to improve their employability and information to educate workers about their rights. Over 3,300 employers hire workers for day, temporary, and permanent jobs every year.

In the last year, more than 4,400 students received ESOL (multiple levels), literacy and citizenship classes, as well as computer and vocational training at CASA, with special classes in the evening for day laborers. CASA provides information about the availability of basic social services and refers clients to government and private social service programs for which they and their families may be eligible.

CASA of Maryland's works to address public health and primary care needs in the community. This includes health education and improved access to screening and treatment services for HIV, cancer and tobacco use prevention. There is on site HIV counseling and testing services two times per week and primary medical care one day per week. CASA also provides a bilingual telephone health line to inform community members of available services and to help them navigate the medical system; and provides medical interpreting services for limited English speakers.

Community-based organizations take on a unique and crucial role in immigrant integration, particularly at the local level. In the United States, more so than in Europe, these groups have come to be viewed as key agents of integration. Across cities in the

United States, for example, community organizations have provided or referred immigrants and refugees to vocational training programs, language education, and assistance in applying for social benefits, permanent residency, and citizenship. Others have created innovative initiatives that contribute to immigrant integration, ranging from financial literacy and mental health programs to business clubs and democracy seminars. While some function independently from others, others form partnerships with other immigrant and community organizations to muster up adequate political momentum to lobby local, state, and national governments to pursue their interests or simply to pool resources for service provision.

US participants shared the experiences in their organizations, where services, such as language training and youth programs are offered; and immigrant communities play a prominent role in determining their political futures. EU participants reciprocated and we heard from many such projects—such as the Kurdish Human Rights Project, which has reached out to the established Kurdish community to assist with the social and psychological issues and education gap that newly arriving migrants face.

Spotlight: "The Flemish Forum for Ethnic Minorities"

The Flemish Forum for Ethnic Minorities is supported by the Flemish Government, and is recognized by law as a group which speaks on behalf of ethnic minority groups. The Forum is also recognized by the Flemish government as an advisory group to 1500 grassroots ethnic minority organizations. The grassroots organizations are viewed by the government as a way to provide information to incoming migrants and as a gateway into society. The Forum along with and through ethnic community based organizations provides education and employment services to migrants. The Forum also assists these grassroots organizations in obtaining funding from the government.

The Forum provides social services, acts as a political organizer, and serves to bring ethnic community based organizations together. In working to create a network of organizations that could deliver a message to the government about the needs of minorities, the Forum worked with the minority community organizations to develop common policy messages for effective advocacy. Every two years the Forum organizes a conference to bring together politicians and the ethnic minority organizations.

The Forum set out to improve the status of immigrants in Belgium. Since the children of minorities were not performing well in school, the Forum set a high priority on improving education. They also worked with the government to create new employment policies, in an effort to increase the minority employment rate. They engaged with media groups in a discussion about minority images to combat the negative images of minorities and migrants in the media. For each policy priority, the Forum identifies policy flaws, and attempts to mobilize politicians on the issue. In the past they have organized protests to impact policy; and worked with labor unions, universities, other committees, and other stakeholders to accomplish their policy goals. Network building and providing a voice for all migrants is the most important part of the Forum's work.

The European community organizers and activists on the tour voiced frustration over inadequate government support for their activities. In part, this may stem from historical

and cultural differences in supporting community organizations in their efforts to integrate ethnic or racial minorities, as well as immigrants. France, for example, only began allowing immigrants to freely form associations from 1981, and still, as discussed on the tour, migrant-based organizations in the French region of Brussels have a very short lifespan, due to the lack of funding. In recent years, however, governments—both at the national and local levels—have begun to appreciate the increasing relevance of ethnic community-based organizations as agents of integration. In Brussels, the Flemish regional government provides large subsidies for ethnic community based organizations.

Community-based organizations play an important role in community building and sometimes result in the economic revival of an area or in development projects abroad. During the MLC tour visit to the neighborhood of Rue du Brabant in Brussels, Belgium, tour participants learned about migrant businessmen who revitalized an area, not only with the shops they set up, but also with the donations they made to establish football clubs, social and cultural clubs, charities, mosques, and schools. In Berlin and London, tour participants heard about refugee groups who were involved in community building projects, such as raising funds to rebuild villages and remove mines in their home country or in rebuilding local community centers.

In the United States, as an integral player in civil society, community-based organizations often approach governments in tandem with other civil society players to advocate policy changes. US participants discussed the broad coalition of immigrant-led groups that came together with other sectors of society to strategize and control the message to law makers as well as to engage in broad political mobilization.

One aspect of the debate that deserves further consideration is the fact that immigrants in Europe arguably face more barriers than their American counterparts in inserting their voice in the policy debates. In recent years, governments across Europe have made strides in helping to foster and consolidate immigrant political power. To ease the administrative procedures for the distribution of funds, the Belgian government, for example, began to distribute funds to municipalities which in turn distributed funds to community organizations. Discussion in the tour suggested some important lessons. Community organizations must ensure all voices they claim to represent are being heard and they should constantly engage in self-evaluation. Without these two crucial factors, there is a danger that the most marginalized communities will continue to be underrepresented or ignored.

Migration learning Community participants also pointed out the fundamental role of foundations in such a debate. Lessons included that foundations too must evaluate the plurality of the organizations they are funding, while assisting with capacity building and establishing clear and stable funding priorities. With clear goals, measurable benchmarks, and assistance through networks and funding, ethnic and community based organizations can continue to build leadership, capacity, and efficacy of service provision.

Whether or not community organizations in Europe will expand to the necessary economies of scale to genuinely influence policy is unclear. What is—prima facie—clear

is that immigrant-led organizations are better resourced and more effective, more powerful, in the United States.

V. Faith and Immigration

The connection between Islam and terrorism and security concerns in the public debate has created troubling trends.

- Participant, MLC

Many youth are forced to prove that they are more British than Muslim. However, many Muslims are quite comfortable straddling both worlds, and many see it as something quite enriching. The problem arises when they are forced to choose between the two worlds.

- Sherifa, Muslim Youth.net

Concerns

The September 11th and subsequent terrorist plots and attacks have ushered in a new era of discourse on integration. Across the Atlantic, governments have increasingly focused their attention on addressing the formation of parallel communities—ones in which Muslims or immigrants live in a bubble of their own, separate from other segments of mainstream society. Thus far, policy talks have centered on the establishment of Muslim schools and prayer spaces as well as on state-approved imams, and cultural and religious attire in public institutions. All seem to focus on "accepting" these so-called Islamic elements as part of the natural landscape of US and European societies.

The Muslim integration debate has called into question whether Muslims hold values that fundamentally contradict those embedded in Western states. While scholars and policy experts have widely criticized those making such broad juxtapositions and adopting a "clash of civilizations" line, publics remain concerned about their "Muslim" populations—no matter how diverse the composition of their Muslim populations may be.

Looking Ahead

For many, faith is a key part of identity and therefore also essential to the discussion on immigrant integration. Citizens who lack a sense of belonging to the larger society are sometimes able to find outlets for participation in their faith community. As Europe approaches its *Year of Intercultural Dialogue* in 2008, governments and civil society actors widely acknowledge the need to step up their efforts to integrate Muslims in their countries and localities, with a particular focus developing church-state relations.

Today, Muslims in non-Russian Europe are the largest religious minority and number approximately 21 million.[12] In addition to the oft drawn association between radical Islam and recent terrorist acts, the relative social, economic and political marginalization

[12] Ceri Peach, "Muslim Population of Europe: A Brief Overview of Demographic Trends and Socioeconomic Integration, with Particular Reference to Britain," in *Muslim Integration: Challenging Conventional Wisdom in Europe and the United States* (Washington DC: Center for Strategic and International Studies, September 2007).

of a large number of Muslims in Europe has pushed the integration of Muslims to the fore of public policy debates.

In recent years, governments have held or supported dialogues with faith communities, emphasizing the need to respect freedom of religion and foster a shared sense of belonging. Such ongoing dialogues have helped Muslim communities to secure more prayer spaces, appoint chaplains in public hospitals, and set up religious councils to foster discussions and representation on the local and national levels.

The development and firmer establishment of such Muslim councils in the landscapes of many EU Member States have had a positive effect on Muslim integration. The *Conseil français du culte musulman* in France, for instance, believes its role is to represent French Muslims and further the integration debate, not to discuss security issues related with extremism.

As such, faith is playing an increasingly prominent role in debates on immigrant integration as governments seek more involvement of Muslim and other religious leaders in fostering intercultural dialogue and identifying priorities. Whether such religious leaders—who often take on a role (sometimes endorsed by governments) as official religious representatives—truly represent the diverse faith groups in any country is debatable, their inclusion in the political process as government consultants is nonetheless an important starting point for their integration.

Again, Migration Learning Community participants drew on their experiences and offered strategies and best practice. In the United States, faith-based organizations often help immigrants to integrate by offering tangible services instead of primarily serving as consultants that advise and help governments in fostering intercultural dialogues between different religious and non-religious communities. For example, many churches and other faith-based organizations have supported or organized voter registration drives, informed immigrants of their rights, and assisted in filing applications for permanent residency or citizenship to the government.

Of course, there are European examples. In London, participants heard about MuslimYouth.net, which engages Muslim youth in a dialogue on their place in society and in their culture and provides a bridge with the British service providers, particularly those dealing with issues of identity and mental health.

Clearly, there is room to think further about the role of faith in integration and how faith-based organizations can promote or be brought into debates and policy on integration. More specifically on Muslim communities, given the post-9/11 environment, there is much to learn in how to develop an inclusive identity and how government and community talk to each other—from the development of leadership to formal and informal dialogues.

Spotlight: Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc.

Formed by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) in 1988, the Catholic Legal Immigration Network, Inc. (CLINIC) was established as a legally distinct organization to support a rapidly growing network of community-based immigration programs. CLINIC's network was originally comprised of 17 programs. It has since increased to 156 diocesan and other affiliated immigration programs with 255 field offices in 48 states. The network employs roughly 1,200 attorneys and "accredited" paralegals who, in turn, serve 400,000 low-income immigrants each year. CLINIC and its member agencies represent low-income immigrants without reference to their race, religion, gender, ethnic group, or other distinguishing characteristics.

CLINIC's mission is to enhance and expand delivery of legal services to indigent and low-income immigrants principally through diocesan immigration programs and to meet the immigration needs identified by the Catholic Church in the United States. CLINIC's mission and activities are guided by the Catholic principle of subsidiarity. Subsidiarity leads CLINIC to respect the roles and capacities of its community-based member agencies. It encourages them to assume as much responsibility for local needs as they can. This allows CLINIC to focus its resources on needs that local member agencies cannot meet. In this way, CLINIC maximizes the productivity of its programs nationwide. CLINIC fulfills its mission by providing a full range of legal and non-legal support services to 161 member agencies comprised of Catholic legal immigration programs. These member agencies serve poor immigrants seeking family reunification, citizenship, and protection from persecution and violence. CLINIC also creates funding and manages direct legal service projects that are national in scope and thus supplements local member agency capacity or expertise. Finally, CLINIC works in collaboration with the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops to advocate with the DHS, EOIR and the DOJ to improve immigration policies and practices.

Spotlight: European Muslim Network

The members of European Muslim Network believe that a new, contextualized approach to the 'Muslim heritage' is crucial in the evolving process of identification and in the context of the challenges of our time. The EMN calls upon Muslims to realize their responsibility and participate in the construction of an Islam in Europe that is modern, defiant, reflective and self-conscious, for the benefit of the European society at large and in the interest of the Muslim communities in Europe in particular.

It is against this background that the "European Muslim Network" has emerged and aspires to become an important platform of ideas within Europe, a vocal platform for those who are not heard. Through networks and meetings, EMN works to honor and promote common values; demonstrate that Islamic teachings and values are in harmony with the rights and responsibilities of a European Muslim citizen; bring together Muslim activists across the continent, who share common concerns and commitments related both to the Islamic tradition and the European societies; and encourage its members to exchange ideas and think collectively about a range of related topics central to contemporary societies.

The "European Muslim Network" subscribes to the idea of a Europe with Jewish, Christian and Islamic roots, by promoting amongst the Muslim communities of Europe the development of constructive criticism, unbiased reflection, peaceful debate and other rational activities with regard to Europe's presence and future from within the perspective of the cultural universe of Islam. The "European Muslim Network" intends to facilitate the blossoming of a distinctive European and at the same time Muslim personality.

VI. Unauthorized Immigration

Human Rights is no longer a fashionable term, security is all the rage.

- Participant, MLC

It is naïve to assume that granting migrants political rights solves problems, because often the main problem is the economic situation.

- Thierry Kochuyt

Migrant children are suffering the consequences because adults are not moving on policy.

- Angelica Salas

Concerns

Political parties and politicians running on anti-immigration platforms both in the United States and in many European Member States have incited fear among their publics about immigrants draining public services and increasing unemployment. The often unfounded political claims about the negative effects of immigration have stigmatized the unauthorized immigrant population. A Public Agenda poll released in the fall of 2007 revealed that more than 80 percent of the American public gave a government a grade of C or worse on illegal immigration.

Furthermore, in an age when terrorism has become a more global and imminent threat, the same poll showed that over half (52 percent) of those polled believe that tighter controls on immigration to the United States would enhance US security a great deal and over a third (36 percent) believe that tighter control over foreign students who come to US colleges and universities to study would have the same effect.

The United States and many countries in Europe are increasingly pointing to large-scale regularization programs as both a facilitator and a cause for increasing unauthorized immigrant populations across Europe. The implementation of the Schengen Area as an area of free movement has also raised concerns about the effect national policies have for the rest of EU.

Looking Ahead

Unauthorized immigration remains a crucial issue in policy and political circles and among immigrant organizations. The collapse of the comprehensive immigration reform bills in the US House of Representatives in 2006 and the US Senate in 2007 not only indicates the highly politicized nature of the immigration debate, but also the end of a six-year quest by pro-immigration groups to gain legal status, through multiple channels, for the vast majority of unauthorized immigrants in the United States. Such a collapse had

not taken place at the time of the tour, and was clearly a recurrent thread in debates across the Migration Learning Community.

Many MLC participants from the United States expressed concern over the integration of over 12 million unauthorized immigrants in their country. As governments began to step up their efforts to sanction employers of unauthorized immigrants, immigrant advocates pushed for the protection of unauthorized workers from abuse. Some claim that despite efforts to protect unauthorized immigrant workers, the unauthorized population will never fully integrate unless they are legalized through some sort of amnesty program.

Others expressed their frustration at how the current political environments across the Atlantic downplay the importance of engaging in serious discussions over effective integration policies and instead focus on security issues and the negative consequences unauthorized immigration has on societies. Policymakers often do not discuss tragedies along the southern US and European borders in humanitarian terms but rather in the context of security, pointing to the need make their frontiers less porous.

However, many fail to understand that many, if not most, unauthorized immigrants are already integrated economically, if not socially. The steady demand for low-wage and low-skilled workers in the United States and in countries across Europe has meant that immigrants are able to find jobs. If anything, their unauthorized status simply means that they lack social guarantees ranging from protection of social rights and wages to access to education. During the tour, participants were exposed to some of the leading practitioners in the area. The Europe-based Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM) has worked to promote rights for the unauthorized in several areas for instance—on healthcare, for example.

In addition to national and local policy approaches to immigrant integration, one of the long-term strategies that sending, transit, and receiving countries of immigration have begun to adopt is linking migration policies with those of development. As discussed in the European Commission's communication on *Circular Migration and Mobility Partnerships between the European Union and Third Countries* (2007), the EU is looking to closely link migration with development in its strategic effort to better manage legal migration. In providing adequate legal channels for immigrants to work in Europe on a short-term basis, EU Member States are looking to increase the circulation of immigrant labor, and as a consequence make it less necessary for immigrants to make dangerous journeys to enter Europe.

In essence, mobility partnerships allow citizens of certain third countries to have better access to temporary employment in the EU if their countries meet certain conditions such as cooperating on stemming unauthorized migration by, among other ways, improving border control, readmitting their own nationals, developing better economic and social conditions at home, and helping returning migrants reintegrate into their societies. Parallel to these circular migration routes, the United States and EU Member States have considered increasing paths from temporary statuses to permanent residence and citizenship.

The integration of unauthorized immigrants, however controversial it may be, remains a large policy question. From the more philosophical questions of whether unauthorized immigrants have a right to receive services to the more practical issues of what services they are eligible for, the issue of immigrant integration for the unauthorized is nonetheless one that pervades public debates.

Spotlight: Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants (PICUM)

The Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants aims at promoting respect for the human rights of undocumented migrants within Europe. PICUM considers the following international treaties and conventions as basic values: International Convention for the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families (ICMW), Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), European Convention for the Protection of Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms (ECHR), Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC), International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESR), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), European Social Charter (ESC), Convention relating to the Status of Refugees, Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (CEDAW), Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment (CAT), and the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD). The social rights of citizens as expressed in the constitutions of the national states involved are also taken into account.

PICUM works to promote respect for the basic social rights (such as the right to health care, the right to shelter, the right to education and training, the right to a minimum subsistence, the right to family life, the right to moral and physical integrity, the right to legal aid, the right to organize and the right to fair labor conditions) of undocumented migrants; to promote regularization of undocumented migrants; and to promote respect for human rights and humane treatment during the process of involuntary return of undocumented migrants. In order to achieve its mission, PICUM gathers information on law and practice regarding social rights, detention and deportation of irregular immigrants, and the possibilities of regularization of their residence; develops expertise in these fields with a view to providing the members of PICUM and other interested parties with expertise, advice and support; encourages networking between organizations dealing with undocumented migrants in Europe; and formulates recommendations for improving the legal and social position of these immigrants, in accordance with the national constitutions and international treaties. These recommendations are presented to the relevant authorities, to other organizations and to the public at large.

Spotlight: Coalition for Humane Immigrants Rights of Los Angeles

The Coalition for Humane Immigrants Rights of Los Angeles (CHIRLA), was founded as a multiethnic collaborative of advocacy groups, social service providers, policymakers, and legal services organizations dedicated to advancing the human and civil rights of immigrants and refugees in Los Angeles. In 1994, CHIRLA faced California's passage of Proposition 187, denying access to social services, health care, and public education to undocumented immigrants. Although ultimately found unconstitutional, Proposition 187 fostered an environment of fear, harassment at work for both legal and unauthorized immigrants, public humiliation as services were denied in restaurants and banks, and a widespread misperception that basic rights afforded under US law no longer applied. In response to this crisis, CHIRLA spearheaded public awareness and education campaigns, and instituted an Information Hotline & Referral Service, providing accurate, reliable information to the immigrant community and dispatching hundreds of speakers throughout Los Angeles to dispel rumors and allay fears.

PART TWO: LESSONS LEARNED AND WAYS FORWARD

VII. Key Findings

The three policy themes discussed were among the most important themes that emerged "organically" from discussions, as well ones with genuine transatlantic learning potential and import.

Part Two of this report sets out a more coherent set of thoughts that were repeated and refined by participants. Such thoughts were also raised in the first learning tour, and those presented below are a combination of both tours and the majority position of the Migration Learning Community as a whole.

Communication Strategies

An essential area of learning is how to shape messages for specific frameworks and audiences (such as policymakers, grassroots groups, general community, and conservative groups).

Such learning must build on existing base of practice. Concrete points include the need to link migration issues to components that are viewed positively/sympathetically in the debate (such as high skilled immigration and youth issues); the importance of creating a message that is proactive and not reactive; and the need to be aware of the side effects of arguments, in consideration of a larger strategy.

Looking to the future, the Migration Learning Community was interested in finding messaging that was applicable to more than one area, especially in connecting to human rights. Examples given by participants included the recommendation that NGOs in Europe should examine whether the Human Rights framework continues to be the most effective manner in which to frame their message, and conversely, US organizations should examine whether their message has shifted too far from a discussion based on human rights. For instance, little attention is brought to the abuses that occur in countries that the US deports migrants to.

MLC participants suggested NGOs should develop common messages and campaigns for regularization and integration and establish partner organizations across the Atlantic.

Coalition Building

Building coalitions was seen as the key to the success of advocacy and lobbying strategies, and therefore essential, however difficult it may be. Participants saw the need to develop links between local grassroots organizations and national activists, between local groups with different backgrounds, and a frame of mind that was open to building unlikely alliances with strange bedfellows if they advance the overall goal of better policy.

These might include obvious links, such as between social inclusion and antipoverty organizations, as well as less obvious ones, such as businesses.

Migrant Leadership and Capability

Participants were clear on the need for leadership and expanding competence and capacity. Yet this debate could be much more grounded. MLC participants pointed to the power of immigrant based unions; the use of existing institutions, such as ethnic based museums as a tool for educating policymakers and the public; new opportunities, such as the capacity of hometown associations to strengthen or build an integrated civil society; as well as more traditional leadership programs and capacity-building exercises. (These could include a variety of best practices from immigrant-led NGOs that act as service providers and advocates.)

A transatlantic leadership seminar for immigrant leaders was suggested.

Specific Policy Areas and Best Practice

MLC participants discussed a swathe of policy areas. Among the most commonly mentioned that had room for further work was children's education, particularly in respect to language.

When applying best practices, participants also recommended that NGOs should be flexible, examining the context in which the practice is used, what limitations exist in society, and what parts of the best practice can be transferred to other contexts.

A common bulletin board with best practices could be developed.

VIII. Overcoming the Immigration Stigma: Challenges Ahead

When addressing problems faced by migrants, a holistic solution should be examined. Policymakers should look for solutions in the sending country, journey, and reception country. They should pass policies that minimize deaths, affect change in economic policies, implement logical immigration procedures, and create a livable environment in the home countries.

– Participant, MLC

This report has examined three immigrant integration-related topics that were discussed at length during the MLC Tour. All three are controversial and are the subject of many debates among political parties and publics across Europe and the United States. The report has also detailed some broad thoughts or "findings" from the participants.

Public fears about immigrants stealing jobs from natives, driving down wages, creating segregated ethnic and religious enclaves, and speaking their own tongues without learning the commonly spoken language of the country have proliferated as the media and politicians have delivered often unfounded images of the perils of immigration.

When coupled with the fear of terrorists and other dangerous people entering their borders, immigration can be considered one of the most hotly debated issues of our time. But the very issues that publics resent are also the ones that they must directly address as they are also the key drivers of immigrant integration.

For one, immigration to the United States and the EU will not stop in the foreseeable future for many reasons. Demographics and economic interests are the two most obvious drivers, but other factors such as family ties and man-made or natural disasters will also continue to feed migration flows. Given the almost inevitable future growth of immigration to countries across the Atlantic, governments and key civil society actors will be obliged to put immigrant integration at the top of their policy agendas. As such, the design and implementation of effective educational, vocational, cultural, and language programs as will also become increasingly important.

Instead of viewing ethnic and community-based organizations as immigrant or other minority-led organizations that encourage the creation of ethnic enclaves and parallel communities, governments and publics should regard them as key agents of integration. Not only do ethnic and community-based organizations often serve as the first point of contact that refugees and other immigrants have in their countries of destination, they also provide essential support in helping immigrants to find jobs or file government applications for social services, permanent residency, or citizenship. The establishment of immigrant-run businesses can help spur community-based investment to build vibrant communities.

Faith and immigration is another topic that has created backlashes in communities across Europe, particularly in the post-9/11 context and with regard to Muslims. Governments have however begun to engage in dialogues with religious leaders and encourage them to

speak out for their communities. Europe has much to learn from the many initiatives and programs that faith-based organizations in the United States have pursued to better integrate immigrants such as conducting voter registration and citizenship drives.

Finally, unauthorized immigration will continue to be a political thorn across the Atlantic. Right wing party campaigns such as those conducted by the Swiss People's Party (SVP) in Switzerland have garnered a large public support base and the place of immigrants in European societies has become evermore uncertain. However, governments must contemplate the root causes of unauthorized immigration and strategize long-term solutions to stem such movements. Efforts to coordinate migration policies with development objectives and to create new legal channels for immigrants to work in the advanced US and EU economies on a short-term basis are steps in the right direction.

In their efforts to reform immigration policies, the United States and EU Member States need to take a more holistic approach to immigration—one that makes immigrant integration as an integral part of reform. It will become increasingly important for societies to engage themselves as a whole in the immigration debate, adopting approaches that involve not only governments but key civil society actors and community leaders. Forward-looking thinking on advancing the economic, social, and political integration of immigrants will often involve local partnerships between national and provincial immigration authorities, chambers of commerce, vocational training centers, and immigrant organizations. The resulting synergies will help transform the "culture" in dealing with immigration in the United States and across Europe from one of fear and resentment to that of multiplayer and multidirectional engagement.

ANNEX A: SUMMARY OF EUROPEAN TOUR

Introducing the Tour

Sunday, November 12, 2007

The group participated in an informal welcome dinner, where participants were introduced to each other. The group was welcomed by Françoise Pissart, King Baudouin Foundation and Demetrios G. Papademetriou, President, Migration Policy Institute.

Maria Teresa Rojas, Open Society Institute explained the goals of the tour and Thierry Timmermans, formerly with the King Baudouin Foundation of Brussels, provided an overview of the group's itinerary in Brussels.

Setting the Stage: International Migration and the Promise of Integration

Monday, November 13, 2007

The session held in the BELvue Museum, was moderated by Liz Collett, European Policy Centre. Panelists included: Jean-Louis De Brouwer, EU Commission Justice, Freedom and Security; Jan Niessen, Migration Policy Group; Bjarte Vandvik and Richard Williams, European Council on Refugees and Exiles; and Donald Kerwin, Catholic Legal Immigration Network Inc.

As the first session of the tour, this panel provided the group with context for the week long program and a brief overview of migration issues in Europe. Key introductory discussion points included:

- In the past 15 years, Europe has undergone dramatic demographic shifts and major changes regarding migration policy. The member states of the EU have become areas of constant immigration rather than emigration. Immigration is the source of Europe's recent population growth, and migration in Europe has become a key topic. The major policy development was free movement for European citizens throughout the EU.
- The member states began working on the issue of asylum over 15 years ago. In 1999, the Tampere Agreement produced the first set of legally binding EU-level agreements on asylum, and Member States have shown a commitment to Tampere. Four key elements emerged, and the EU has since undertaken certain policies to achieve these goals:

1. *Partnership with countries of transit.* This relationship is a key part of the internal policy of the EU and is seen as a way to mitigate irregular migration. There is increasing focus on reconciling the EU migration development agenda. The European Commission is developing a strategy for processing asylum cases outside the EU and a regional protection program for housing large numbers of refugees. The EU, also

working on improving the structure and implementation of its return policy, is working with sending countries on facets of the program and readmission negotiations.

2. *Creation of a common asylum program.* The EU has set a goal of 2010 to have a common system for processing and dealing with asylum cases. Challenges and concerns in this area are: the increasingly hostile political environment surrounding refugees and asylees (known as asylum seekers in Europe); the decreasing number of asylum seekers leading to less focus on policy solutions; and Member States, rather than pursuing policies of shared responsibility, are increasingly blaming each other. Also, member state governments are not focused on those individuals who may be in need of protection, but are not receiving it. If the Commission seriously looked at those in need of protection, a complete system redesign would be necessary.

3. *The goal of promoting legal economic migration*. Participants discussed how the needs for legal migration are not always met through legal channels. To promote legal migration, the Commission created family reunification and long term residency permits for researchers and scholars (which is at the margins of the issue). The Commission has a long term action plan for placement and support of economic migrants, released in 2005. The recent news about an EU Blue Card reflects such policy development.

4. *Fighting unauthorized immigration.* Unauthorized migration is a growing issue in Europe. Countries, such as Spain, have often opted for regularization or amnesty programs as a solution. Amnesty is controversial among Member States since, effectively, there are no internal borders and amnesty in one country affects all Member States. The EU was working to prevent unauthorized migration by enhancing its visa and border policy. The EU now has a common external border policy, supported by a database program (VIS). Criminal sanctions against employers have also been mooted. Commentators made the point that in the fight against unauthorized migration, the basic human rights of the unauthorized should always be protected.

The discussion moved on to the topic of integration. Key points included:

- A challenge to the assumption that the United States will continue to be as successful as it has historically been in integrating immigrants, evidenced by the inability of 12 million undocumented migrants to integrate fully into US society and the number of communities dealing with new large immigration streams that are not prepared to integrate these populations into their communities.
- Concern over the lack of representation of ethnic minority groups at the European level of policy making and the related effort to increase their integration and participation
- Criticism of the Commission's paternalistic relationship with immigrants; and the need to view immigrants as social, economic, and political actors, with both rights and obligations.

- An Emphasis on creating citizenship opportunities and incorporating migrants into society. Once immigrants are viewed to have rights, discussion can focus on antidiscrimination measures to protect migrants. Instruments can be created to check on EU Member States to see how they are incorporating immigrants.
- A recommendation that the Commission should create a forum to analyze best practices. This would include how citizenship is promoted; how access to naturalization and papers could be implemented; how the ability of immigrants to exercise rights can be improved; how citizenship education programs can be created; and examining what is political and social participation.
- A discussion on the UN convention on the Rights of Migrant Workers. Politically and administratively, the UN convention would not work in the United States and Europe as a policy, but it should be viewed as a reference document against which to measure very concrete national laws or European policies. The convention does not need to be ratified by governments. However, it has been a useful benchmark that NGOs can use to measure national policies. Increasing the rights based approach in policy making could serve to answer calls for international accountability calling for ratification of the UN convention on migrant's rights.

Sharing Our Perspectives: Small Group Discussions on EU Policy

Participants divided into small groups, and then provided a summary of their discussion to the Migration Learning Community as a whole.

Group I - Amnesty and Regularization: The US versus EU experience, with a focus on the 1986 IRCA legislation and Belgium regularization in 2000

Based on the idea that amnesty is needed due to a failed immigration system, stakeholders should advocate for comprehensive reform that includes a permanent system for legalization.

Civil society should have strategies prepared to promote integration after amnesty. There should be recognition that dialogue with “microgroups” is important. The challenge of incorporating groups into civil society is compounded by the diversity of ethnic and refugees groups, while there is also a common problem where the resource-rich (the educated) dominate the dialogue and some voices are never heard.

There is no strong infrastructure to incorporate migrants: a long term problem. The diversity of voices means that incorporation of one group does not always equal incorporation of others. Solutions include: identifying groups who have an established track record and supporting their movement; establishing a priority and funding a variety of groups along different policy “tracks”; mobilizing migrant actors at the local level first and then at the national levels; and increasing the capacity of ethnic based organizations by providing training on advocacy and fundraising.

Group II - Citizenship

Recently, there has been less emphasis and acceptance of the concept and term "human rights" in the policy sphere; and more emphasis on security. This shift is affecting the citizenship debate. Citizenship can consist of: aspiration, status, identity, allegiance and participation; among the most fundamental of issues.

There was discussion regarding the current disconnect between the policy needed to serve economic interests and the political climate. All participants felt there was a demonstrated need for migrant workers, but politicians still felt it was necessary to be politically tough on asylum and refugee issues in Europe. The group discussed efforts to frame public opinion more effectively.

The group also discussed how in Europe there was a clear disconnect between politics at the EU level and national level and how strategies could be implemented despite this divide.

Group III - Differences between high skilled and low skilled working migrant flows

The definition of who is high skilled is unclear. Highly skilled migrants generally integrate into society at a "higher" level, however highly skilled does not always mean the person will be able to obtain a high skilled position.

Member States have a clear need for low skilled workers. There is no real competition from nationals in Member States trying to fill the jobs that low skilled migrants are willing to take. However, the issue of competition is constantly brought up in the dialogue as a reason to deny low skilled workers entrance to the economy. For example, in European debates, the new EU member state workers are understood to be competing with new immigrant workers for positions, and migrant workers are often losing out.

Seeking Asylum in Brussels

The afternoon visit to Petit Chateau, a reception centre for asylum seekers allowed participants to examine the asylum process in Brussels. The group toured the facility and saw the areas where asylum seekers lived, where tutoring sessions took place, where healthcare was administered, and where general entrance and exit to the facility took place.

After the tour, the group met with Bob Pleysier, former director of Petit Château and current director of FEDASIL, the federal agency for the reception of asylum seekers in Belgium.

In Belgium, asylum seekers can end up in a center or private lodging, and will often remain in that first residence for the duration of the procedural first step in the filing for asylum. Belgium is undergoing a change in the law that will limit the amount of time that an asylum seeker can remain in the first step of the asylum process.

FEDASIL manages up to 15,000 places for asylum seekers and half are organized through settlement centres (in Belgium, there are 25 large scale reception centres, 21 Red Cross centres, 45 small scale centres, and 9 non-governmental organizations that process and provide assistance to asylum seekers). Petit Chateau was the largest of the 800 centers. The reception network serves the basic needs of asylum seekers including social and medical needs.

In Belgium, the Minister for Home Affairs is responsible for the asylum procedure; and the Minister for Social Integration is responsible for the reception of the asylum seeker. The asylum process in Belgium is twofold: (1) admissibility, involving material assistance; (2) an examination of the grounds for the claim and financial assistance. Numbers of asylum seekers in Belgium peaked in 1992 and 2000. Over the past few years, the arrival of asylum seekers has stabilized. The top five countries or areas of origin for asylum seekers arriving in Belgium during 2005 were Russia, the Congo, Serbia, Iraq, and Slovakia.

For those who fail their asylum claim, the reception network tries to arrange for voluntary return. Two funds had been set up to deal with the reintegration of asylum seekers into their home countries. Many "failed" asylum seekers are unauthorized. In the past, large scale legalization for groups of up to 50,000 has taken place in Belgium. Non-governmental organizations are asking for a new program or path for legalization, because there are a growing number of undocumented migrants in the Belgian society.

Transforming Transnational Migration Management: A Strategy Session

Nele Verbruggen, King Baudouin Foundation, moderated a session with Frédérique Mawet, Coordination of Initiatives for and by Refugees and Exiles (CIRE), who spoke about the Belgian Approaches for Return Policies; Pieter De Gryse, Vluchtelingenwerk Vlaanderen, who discussed Refugees Coordination in Flanders and Belgian Challenges for Asylum Policies; Richard Williams, European Council on Refugees and Exiles, who spoke about European Views on Regional Protection; and Marianne C. Yang, New York State Defenders Association, who provided a response from the US perspective.

The session was held in Foyer, which was a regional integration centre, established in 1970. The Foyer education project consisted of a school and after school activities, including homework assistance. Foyer also provided social services and had a project to prevent racism.

Key points from the discussion include:

- In Belgium, there has been a sharp decline in the number of asylum seekers. Suggested causes were a worldwide a decrease in the numbers of refugees and the increased efficiency of policies that can be loosely termed "Fortress Europe". For example, throughout Europe, there has also been an increase in the number of rejections of applications; in Belgium, 90 percent of asylum seekers were rejected.

- "Failed" asylum seekers often try to obtain residency through other channels. Some have been successful, others often become undocumented or are returned. The falling numbers of asylum seekers has not decreased polarization. Governments are constantly increasing security measures and using rhetoric regarding the size the problem is in order to justify more protections.

When discussing transnational migration management, there are four areas of concern:

1. The need to preserve the level of protection for spontaneously arriving asylum seekers despite a decrease in the level of funding.

2. The need to preserve legal access to asylum through both national laws and EU laws. While, advocacy for a resettlement scheme is important, NGOs should work to ensure that it is not transformed into a vehicle for non-settlement.

3. The issue of burden sharing and shifting of responsibilities should be addressed through concentrated advocacy work at the EU level to change the unfair and inefficient Dublin system, and through advocacy on the national level for protection (For example, the Flemish Refugee Council, along with other Belgian NGOs, was able to convince the Belgian government that standards of protection are not always high enough in other European countries and consequently they were able to block the deportation of Kurds to Greece.)

4. Protection in the regional domain is important, and while there are plenty of reasons to fund regional protection areas, NGOs must work to ensure that this does not mean a substantial decrease in funding for spontaneously arriving asylum seekers.

- There is a role for NGOs to work on creating and advocating for return policies, where returnees are provided the most dignity and highest security possible, along with benefits.
- A global migration project is an option that should be seriously examined. There could be long term assistance with reintegration into countries of return or return policies could be integrated with development programs abroad, so returnees can be involved in the development of their own society. In Belgium, a key goal is to offer social services and psychological support and help the person make decision to stay or leave. If the asylee makes the decision to return, the Belgian government provides each returnee with €750 for implementing a community project in their home country. The German and British governments also offer subsidies to individuals returning to their country of origin.
- The European policy focus on the deterrence of unauthorized migration has a negative impact on refugees. Refugees are seen as a security threat and their integration is a security issue. Additionally, political party lines are blurring in the European Parliament on the issue of migration and security; and this presents lobbying challenges and opportunities for NGOs.
- In the United States, the advocacy and policy community tends to focus on the 12 million undocumented and individuals who have lost their legal resident status, rather

than refugees. The challenge in United States is to raise awareness regarding the issues of citizenship for unauthorized immigrants and whether deportation is justified. Deportation policy tends to get lost in the debate surrounding the large numbers of undocumented.

- Much of European policy is concerned with preventing asylum seekers from coming to Europe. Funds are offered to NGOs and governments in the regions generating asylum seekers in an effort to provide regional protection and prevent problems that cause individuals to flee the area. There are almost no funds for resettlement.
- The NGO community sanitizes its language too much when discussing 'return' (deportation). The reality is that some refugees returned to their home country are tortured or murdered.
- On the EU level there are no lists for "safe countries" of origin and transit (where some countries are deemed automatically "safe" and therefore claims for asylum from those countries are much harder to prove). However, many Member States have developed these lists. Belgium does not have a list of safe countries, but does have a list of unsafe countries. Some European NGOs would work to return an individual to Afghanistan, but Belgium would not allow that.

Several projects and advocates have been working in this area:

- The European Council for Refugees and Exiles (an NGO campaigning for refugees) believes that there should be monitoring of whose asylum has been rejected.
- Coordination of Initiatives for and by Refugees and Exiles (CIRE), created in 1954 as a trade union for asylum seekers in Belgium, works on policy issues related to asylum seekers, detention, and exportation. The organization also provides social services to refugees and asylum seekers. They have provided over 20,000 hours in translation services and have helped migrants with education and housing. They have also developed a project with other NGOs to assist undocumented migrants. Between 2000 and 2003, CIRE conducted an evaluation of 250 projects started by returning migrants. 800 of the projects have continued more than 2 years.
- The Flemish Refugee Council is a 20 year old umbrella organization. Its main activities are advocacy, awareness, policy work. Over 750 asylum seekers are received annually. The council offers legal advice and assistance with the return program.

European Foundations, Migration and Integration: Actions, Tools and Partners

Françoise Pissart, King Baudouin Foundation, moderated an evening session with Luc Tayart de Borms, of the Network of European Foundations for Innovative Cooperation, and Hans Martens, of the European Policy Centre. Key points from the discussion are summarized below.

- It was argued that foundations in Europe are beginning to understand that the problems in Europe are not localized to particular regions, so solutions should be pan-European. European foundations should be interested in establishing partnerships not

only at the EU level, but also with the relevant capitals. They should also consider involving each other in their work and agendas.

- The European Foundation Centre was described as providing leadership for European foundations. It is an international association of foundations and corporate funders dedicated to creating an enabling legal and fiscal environment for foundations, documenting the foundation landscape, strengthening the infrastructure of the sector, and promoting collaboration, both among foundations and between foundations and other actors.
- European foundations are interested in expanding funding for research and political activities. US foundations are more involved in providing advocacy organizations with capacity building and media relations trainings and deal more directly with immigrant-led NGOs. European foundations have not succeeded in forming relationships with effective immigrant-led NGOs in the same way. Also, there is not the same tradition of think tanks informing policy, as there is in the US.
- Because the European Union is a relatively young institution (recently celebrating 50 years), the associated civil society and democratic processes are still developing. Foundations and think tanks should and can become part of the emerging civil society.

Keynote: Tariq Ramadan, European Muslim Network—What Is Europe Afraid of?

There are two words to summarize the current state of affairs in Europe—*fear and mistrust*—and dialogue cannot move forward without addressing these issues first.

Fear is linked to the notion of identity. There is a fear about the future of the European identity and fear that an alien element is penetrating the identity. There is also the fear of the unknown. As newcomers become more and more visible, long-term residents wonder what the future of "their" society will be. Native residents ask, "What do newcomers want? Do they want to integrate into our society?" There is also fear related to terrorism, and as a result, Muslims may be condemned in their own society.

The reality is that societies in the EU are changing. A conversation based on respect needs to take place, instead of today's conversation based on the concern for national security, and protecting "us" from "them." Efforts are being made in the Muslim community to bring community, government and academic leaders together to determine what can be done to recognize and adapt to the EU reality. Bridges should be built to reach the grassroots, and the notion of shared responsibility between all groups should be promoted. Trust is something that is built between groups based on experience with each other. Fear is a legitimate reaction that should not be dismissed in the dialogue but the manipulation of that fear is problematic. In the United States fear and patriotism are being manipulated to oppress people. Education is the way to combat fear.

Mistrust also exists on many different levels. European Muslims often do not trust the media, politicians, and local authorities. The native born population does not trust Muslims. This mistrust and separation happened with the Jewish community in the previous century. In order to overcome mistrust, there needs to be shared responsibility to move beyond the "us versus them mentality".

Identity is important – it defines who "we" are and who "they" are. The definition of identity forces individuals to determine what they are first and foremost: Muslim, British, or Swiss, for example. However, it should be acknowledged that no one has one single identity. There is a not a clash of civilizations in the EU—there is a clash of perceptions; and self-perception plays a large role in identity.

In discussing immigrant integration, a sense of belonging is central. If one feels that he/she belongs to a community, there is a sense of responsibility to help build the community. This is the highest level of integration and means the person has psychologically integrated. An immigrant can be socially or economically integrated, but be psychologically disintegrated. When one is not psychologically integrated the "us versus them" mentality prevails. The goal should be create a sense of belonging, so people feel at home, and are willing to build a brighter future.

A disconnect between politicians and the reality of our societies exists. The Muslim community is looking for more respect and a voice in civil society. Societies should examine what common issues are faced by all groups. The current trend is that Muslim academics are invited to discuss violence, but not democracy, the environment, or other issues. True democracy provides space to engage with a wider reality and discuss sensitive issues.

There should be a focus on common values. There are large numbers of individuals and groups that are working toward building a common vision for the future, which should be recognized. It is important to talk about true dialogue and build on it. We need a national movement based on local initiatives and conversations. There should be a movement beyond cultural ghettos (Black, Muslim, Latino, White, etc) to the creation of a "new we." The "new we" should move away from perception of minorities and division. There should be an intersection of values. Today the crisis within the Muslim community is who is speaking for whom. Previously, having no central power in the Muslim community was viewed as an asset. Now unless it is properly managed, it is viewed as a weakness. In the United States there was a rapid change in discourse before and after 9/11. It can be challenging for the Muslim community to participate in this dialogue since the community is extremely diverse (Muslim Americans, African-American Muslims, Muslim converts, etc.)

The new "we" is something that groups will create together. It needs to come from grassroots, and can be built through several key policies:

- Education should stress inclusion, and build upon a history of collective, shared memories where we all feel a sense of belonging.
- Citizenship should emphasize everyone's duties to engage in community building, protect rights, work for justice, and create a sense of belonging.
- Antidiscrimination, where common platforms against racism should be created.

Finally, it is important to send the message that people have multiple identities that should be built upon. This is difficult, but necessary for the future.

Presentation: Ethnic Business & Migrant Community Building in Brussels

Tuesday, November 14, 2007

Thierry Kochuyt from the Catholic University in Brussels discussed his work on the power of social capital building and encouraging civic participation.

In measuring the social capital and civic participation of migrants, it is important to look at both *economics and politics*.

The e*conomic situation* was crucial to immigration: the economic demand for workers caused the first influx of modern migration in Belgium. The mine and steel industries were desperate for labor, and so waves of Italians, Spanish, Greek, Turkish, and Moroccan migrants (largely male) came to Brussels. The 1970 economic recession in Belgium resulted in a shrinking demand for migration and official migration stop in 1974. The migrants already in the country brought their children and families, resulting in an increase in unskilled labor, a mismatch in the labor market, and a congested labor pool. Policies ignored the growing problem resulting in increasing unemployment.

However, *political situation* did not match the economics. Traditional political parties in the 1980s largely ignored the problem of migrants in Belgian society, but the hard right reacted, accusing immigrants of taking advantage of the welfare state and taking jobs from the Belgian people. In response, left wing party members created a movement to grant political access to immigrants and the centrist parties worked to open up Belgian citizenship to migrant workers. However, it was naïve to assume that granting migrants political rights solves problems, because often the main problem is their economic situation.

Overall, there is 60% employment rate in Belgium, 62% employment rate for natives, 57% employment rate for EU citizens, 42% employment rate among non-EU citizens, 28% rate for Turks and Moroccans, and 51% rate for New Belgians. In Belgium, migrants tend to be viewed as second rate workers and their chances of being unemployed are much higher. Two trends have emerged from such a situation. First, there has been an increase in crime. Second, a large proportion of migrant workers began to emerge as entrepreneurs. From 2000 to 2004, there was only a 6.5% increase in the number of native Belgians who opened their own businesses, while there was 16% increase in the Turkish population and 41.9% increase among Moroccans who were self-employed. In summary, Turkish and Moroccan migrants faced economic barriers, policy largely neglected this situation, and in response to blocked opportunities in the labor market, a small but growing minority becomes self-employed.

A good example is the neighborhood of “Rue du Brabant”. As demographics shifted in Brussels, native Belgians moved into the suburbs and only the migrant population was left in the city centre. Since the native population had more economic buying power, businesses like food markets moved to the suburbs, creating “food deserts” in the city

centre. Migrant businesses sprung up to meet this demand; and they were often better equipped to meet specific language demands, cultural preferences in food or dress, or other special preferences.

The new businessmen of the Rue du Brabant ended up investing their profits in community building projects, or sent remittances to their home country. Examples of the community projects in Brussels that have been funded by these migrant businessmen are football clubs, social and cultural clubs, charities, mosques, and schools. One of these schools educates over 500 pupils, including first, second, and third generations. The ethnic economy also opens up avenues for ethnic participation.

Ethnic entrepreneurship in Brussels created an economic market; solved some but not all unemployment issues; filled the need for essential services in the poorest strata of the city; filled the need for developing new ethnic markets; created community capital; and also revitalized Brussels' city centre.

Tour of the Brussels City Center by Lahcen Hammou, Town Center Manager

Mr. Hammou presented on the local business community of Rue du Brabant, in inner city Brussels. The neighborhood had always been an area of transit because of its position next to the train station. A small neighborhood of five square kilometers with a very dense population, over 60,000 resided in the area.

40% of the inhabitants were immigrants. The population included Jewish, Italian, Moroccan, and most recently Pakistani. The population is young – 45% are under the age of 25 with the majority of residents living in a family setting with an average of five children. There is a strong correlation between poverty and youth.

There are over 20,000 houses in the area and the state of accommodations in these dwellings is slowly improving. An estimated 27 % of the housing is adequate and comfortable, while 40% is unsatisfactory. However, the percentage of inadequate accommodations has decreased from 50% to 40%, as a result of the improving economy.

The economic situation of the neighborhood is still poor; the average income is €17,000, which is €7,000 less than the region's average income. Migrants who started business in the 1980's have moved from the city center to the first fringe of suburbs. Because of the migrant community's lack of purchasing power, goods must be cheap. Recently, there has been an increase in prices (and profits) as the shopping area has experienced success.

Perspectives on Migrant Civic & Political Participation: A Strategy Session

The Migration learning Community listened to presentations from leading thinkers in the area of migrant civic engagement and then engaged in a strategy discussion. The session was moderated by Nele Verbruggen, King Baudouin Foundation, and the discussants were Christopher Oliha, Chair of Flemish Forum for Ethnic Minorities; Dirk Jacobs, University of Brussels; Nathalie Caprioli, Brussels Centre for Intercultural Action; and

Joshua Hoyt, Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights. Key points to emerge from the discussion included:

- In Brussels, integration policies were tricky as—like Belgium—there are two regions each with its own languages, Flemish and French. Integration and acceptance of newcomers falls under the regional mandate while the federal government controls the justice issues, such as immigration, social security, and welfare policies.
- The Flemish government has adopted a multicultural policy, copied from Naples. The Flemish system is based on the idea that it is important to acknowledge ethnic and cultural identities; this determines how newcomers are treated and policy is designed. On the other hand, the Francophone regional government had replicated the French republican discourse on citizenship. Both nationals and non-nationals will be treated culturally the same and no differences will be identified for the purpose of policy making. Individuals should be assimilated into the francophone culture as quick as possible. The creation of ethic associations is not encouraged.
- In the Belgian NGO sector, immigrants are underrepresented. Discussants pointed to racism as a possible reason or because of a lack of interest. The NGO community believes each sector should be involved equally in each municipality. By recognizing the diversity of ideas and traditions and encouraging migrants to incorporate them into the society. Since, grassroots organizations are viewed by the Flemish regional government as a way to provide information, education, integration, and employment to incoming migrants and as a gateway into society; they are subsidized by the Flemish government. Consequently, these groups were organized by municipality into federations, funded by the government, which provide social services, act as political organizers, and often represent organizations based in similar cultural identities. Some specific examples of a federation's activity include: working with the government to create new employment and education policies, in an effort to improve minority education and employment rates; combating negative images of minorities and migrants in the media by engaging media groups in discussions; organizing protests to impact policy; and organizing a conference to bring together politicians and the ethnic minority organizations. The French-speaking regional government focuses on social cohesion and a fight against racism. Limited by funding, NGOs in the French portion of Belgium are struggling with how to reach the public and media and more importantly how to reach the migrant community. Ethnic NGOs in French part of Belgium are often short-lived since they are not subsidized like the Flemish region.
- Above this, the European model is a multicultural concept of citizenship. The European challenge is to combine the idea of integration and diversity. Complete assimilation is not possible, not least because of the existence of 25 (now 27 from January 1 2007) Member States. As the EU enlargement continues, with the addition of new Member States and the discussion of Turkey joining, the collection of national identities will increase. Furthermore, there are several sub-national identities in the member countries. Member States are not just experiencing the traditional migratory flows from their former colonies, but from all parts of the globe; and in many countries there is also a Romany population.

- It was argued that to move toward multicultural citizenship Europe needs to ensure that social justice and cultural diversity are linked; there are equal basic rights for all and all should be viewed equally as part of the society; there is a better recognition of diversity and citizens have outlets for participation in ethnic communities (The debate over the European constitution has brought to light some key questions regarding diversity, and whether clearly linking Christian values and the European constitution's basic principals challenges the inclusion of the Islamic identity in European society.); social issues such as education and housing include a diversity policy, since there is no legal ground on which to base an EU integration policy; and political participation for all groups is guaranteed. The ultimate goal of multicultural citizenship is that all groups share the same rights, duties, space, and respect the same laws and values. Their ethnicities can be observed in both the public and private spheres.
- Some US participants felt it was striking that there was little discussion of the use of churches or mosques as vehicles for immigrant integration. In the United States, church communities are often used as vehicles for mobilizing immigrant political participation.
- A broad consensus emerged that the United States should have an official discussion regarding immigrant integration policy. The integration discussion could be based on families, and how communities and families can help to integrate newcomers, instead of what role the government should play.
- The argument for the rights of the undocumented has very different focuses in the United States and the EU. In the United States, it is argued that undocumented workers are necessary for future economic growth, and the natural solution is to legalize and integrate them. In Europe, dialogue surrounding the undocumented is focused on human rights, social justice, and the social welfare system.

Early Reflections and Feedback (Belgium)

To conclude the Belgium leg of the tour, the Migration Learning Community participants took part in a discussion led by Demetrios G. Papademetriou, President, Migration Policy Institute. Some highlights of the discussion are below.

- European countries should examine outcomes or delve deeply into the ultra sensitive questions—what can civil society do to spur discussion on integration, immigrant participation, and antidiscrimination?
- Civil society should consider who is shaping policies. Are immigrants truly empowered and engaged, and are all group's voices being heard?
- The state seems to be locus of activity and mobilization in Europe, funding much of civil society and organizations who advocate. Advocacy groups in this model should examine whether the system limits their ability to be aggressive in pursuing policies and lawmakers (are they beholden to their wishes and policy directives as a result of funding?). There is, however, a broader spectrum of political ideology in Europe, a deeper connection between the government and civil society that can allow for more access to certain aspects of government. NGOs can utilize these connections to shape strategy and policy.

- In the US model, civil society is mostly funded by foundations, and consequently sometimes restricted by their requirements (such as too many directives and a lack of stability). In US civil society, community organizations usually engage in deep strategy discussions with other members of civil society and create alliances with those groups before attempting to influence government.
- The question that emerged from both models was how to build power and representation for all communities in a society and what might emerge in the future.
- The NGO community was evolving in Europe. Many NGOs are becoming service delivery organizations (often driven by the increase in the number of asylum seekers). Many are now changing into advocacy organizations, since the migrant population within Europe is changing. Such developments may require a reassessment of goals—were European NGOs concerned with service delivery, citizenship, or the big policy changes?
- In the United States, NGOs were far more engaged in voter registration campaigns and politics. European participants were challenged to examine what efforts were being used to register immigrants and to find out their opinions and positions.
- Immigrants entering into host societies were often disempowered and were not comfortable making demands. Immigrants can be empowered when their opinions are sought out and they realize they have a voice. In the United States, there is a strong trend of reaching out to new immigrants and mobilizing them to help themselves and organize. Additional work was being done to incentivize and formalize the capacity of immigrants to organize in the United States. Migrants, sometimes coming from societies where they were endangered and impoverished, have different definitions of citizenship and do not recognize the rights they should be granted.
- MLC Participants discussed the demographics of Europe and the social welfare system. In European society is it positive that the state cares for citizens and is it positive to sustain that system, but the risks of patterns of dependency being created among certain groups were also evident.
- Most governments seem to be adopting a multicultural framework. Participants were interested in the way NGOs can convince the government and society at large that the undocumented should be integrated into that framework. US organizations find it helpful to use polling when developing messages and campaigns to frame and shape the debate on the issue of the undocumented and immigration.
- Creating a political movement can be difficult in societies because there is always a question of representation and fear also exists. The movement for the undocumented in Europe focused on social rights. Support from foundations and Churches has been crucial to this movement in many countries, such as Belgium.

Immigration and Immigrant Integration in Berlin and Germany

Dr. Tanja Wunderlich of the German Marshall Fund of the United States provided an overview of the day and explained that the program was designed with the intent of discussing the problem and exploring best practices.

Dr. Barbara John, Former Commissioner for Migration and Integration, Berlin Senate, introduced participants to immigration issues in Berlin and Germany:

History

- After WWII, Germany had no desire to be a country of immigration, but Germany ended up as the country with the largest number of immigrants in the EU. The four categories of immigrants allowed by the German government are:

1. Immediate family members—in 2005, Germany allowed in 70,000 family members.
2. Asylum seekers—the numbers for asylum seekers have been steadily decreasing. In 2005, Germany allowed in 20,000 asylum seekers.
3. Ethnic Germans—the German Constitution provides entry to ethnic Germans (mostly those German settlers who were deported, settled in places in Eastern Europe, and ended up moving back to Germany after the collapse of the former Soviet Union). At its height, Germany let in 100,000 ethnic Germans. Approximately 4-5 million ethnic Germans have returned since WWII. Also, included in this immigration category are Jewish migrants. Approximately 10,000 to 15,000 Jewish migrants are admitted each year.
4. Qualified Migrants—this category of immigration opened in 1995. The definition for qualified migrants was revised in 2005 as someone who earns more than 80,000 euros a year or someone who can invest 1 million Euros into the German economy and create 10 jobs. In 2005, only 900 individuals were accepted into Germany under the qualified migrant category

- Ostensibly because of high unemployment, Germany does not accept the same number of immigrants as many other European countries. In comparison to the United States, Germany's admissions are low. While Germany does not admit a large number of migrants or grant large numbers of worker permits, it is quite generous with welfare. The contrast between the United States and Germany is that in the United States opportunities are open to immigrants but welfare is limited; and in Germany social benefits are provided to immigrants, but opportunities are not always provided.
- There are an estimated one million undocumented migrants in Germany, made up of some Chinese and many seasonal African migrants who come through France and Spain but do not stay in Germany.
- Germany's migration flows were often determined by labor needs and the predominant flow was from Turkey.
- The process for family reunification only takes two months in Germany, but no extended families are allowed. Same sex partners are allowed if they can prove the ability to support.
- The biggest minority in Germany are the Turkish at a population of 2.2 million. Berlin is the largest Turkish city outside of Turkey.
- Berlin also has the largest Palestinian settlement in Germany and Europe. From 1975 to 1990, many came from Lebanon to East Germany. These migrants were taken to Checkpoint Charlie and pushed over into West Germany. In the 1980s, West Berlin was receiving as many as 1,000 Palestinian immigrants a week. As a result, Germany has had a number of people without citizenship that have not been allowed to work. Germany has granted amnesties allowing these Palestinians who after three generations are finally being allowed to work.

- Migration has decreased since Germany has an unemployment rate of 9% now and a 20% unemployment rate for migrants. In Berlin, the current unemployment rate for migrants is 44%.

Integration policy

- Germany has put in place strategies for the integration of the migrant population. First, the German government has removed the legal barriers to a migrants' ability to work by allowing migrants to have work permits. Second, every one who comes to Germany has to complete training courses, designed to integrate migrants. A migrant is required to take 600 hours of language training and will not reach settlement status unless this is met (classes cost one euro per hour or are free if the migrant is on social assistance). Third, labor agencies are providing migrants with training programs for new careers; however this strategy has not met with much success. All children are given the right to go to school in Europe. In Germany, there is a debate on amnesty for unauthorized children, because after attending school, they often have a hard time getting work permits.
- Everyone residing in Germany, whether undocumented, non-citizens, or citizens has basic human rights; registered non-citizens have full social rights; to qualify for professional rights, non-citizens are required to have training, and asylum seekers cannot work; non-citizens do have some economic and political rights, but do not have access to all those that citizens have; and non-citizens can participate as member of party but cannot be elected. Germany recently created its first anti discrimination law based on the directive from the EU. It protects on the basis of nationality, sexual orientation, origin, race, and religion.
- Thirty-two percent of German pupils reach university level, while only twelve percent of immigrant children attend university. The weakness of Germany's educational system is actually a problem for all of the German population not just migrants. Only 2 to 3 percent of teachers are qualified to teach German as second language. There are few community schools or private schools catering to religious or ethnic minorities because it is very difficult to establish such schools in Germany.
- Some European Countries focus on fostering citizenship education. In Germany, the focus is on intercultural education and dialogue. To provide a contrast, the United States has a system of integration run by citizens; Germany has a system where integration is the responsibility of the government.
- Germany speaks about multiculturalism and is fostering bilingual education. However, Germany is only now starting to look at outcomes and evaluate whether the expected results were achieved.

Site Visits

High School Education and Muslim Integration

MLC Participants visited two schools that had large numbers of children of immigrant origin and spoke in small groups with the students. Almost all of the students, the group spoke to were interested in attending University. There were 5 or 6 who were interested

in doing a social year before attending University. Most of the migrant students were not interested in leaving the city to go to other parts of Germany to find a job. Some were interested in going abroad.

Berlin's Immigrant Communities: A Walking Tour

The group went on a walking tour of the Kreuzberg district, a traditional immigrant neighborhood in Berlin. The group met to discuss neighborhood development with Mr. Düspohl, Director of the Kreuzberg Museum, and then took a guided tour through the Kreuzberg Museum's exhibit on the history of immigration to Berlin.

Highlights from the discussion included a presentation on the origins of the Museum. The concept of the museum was to focus on those who had lived in the neighborhood in the past 30 to 40 years. As researchers worked on investigating Turkish migration in the 1960s and 1970s, the assumption that migrants would be from southeast Turkey turned out to be incorrect—many of the migrants had come from Istanbul and Ankara, were highly-skilled, urban dwellers, and mostly women.

In examining migrants' stories it was found that migrants who intended to return to their home country after one or two years had ended up staying for the rest of their lives. Interestingly, though this group did not often see a reason to learn German. Researchers also explained how, after the Berlin Wall fell, many former residents or those who had worked in the neighborhood of Kreuzberg were shocked by the new Turkish demographics of the district. Known as "little Istanbul", there was some confusion and tension in the neighborhood between the East Germans and Turkish migrants. Unemployment remains a big issue.

Like many gateway districts, the population in the neighborhood of Kreuzberg has changed. In the 1990s 20,000 Bosnians arrived into the neighborhood. Prior to that in the 1980s, Palestinians arrived.

Jewish Immigration

At the New Synagogue in Berlin, following musical performances by migrant musicians, Sergey Lagodinsky of the Global Public Policy Berlin Institute, presented on the history of Jewish Immigration to Germany.

The Jewish identity has re-emerged in the German society, but is still very much a minority group. Two million Jews were displaced after World War II with only 400 stayed in East Berlin.

In the Soviet Union, many in the Jewish community were persecuted, first as part of the state anti-Semitism policy and then as part of the societal mindset that persisted. Fleeing persecution, Jews migrated to Israel, and to East and West Germany illegally. The government tolerated the unauthorized migrants. However, as a result of lobbying by the German citizen Jewish community, the West German government granted citizenship to any returnees. As a result, the Jewish community of 27,000 increased to 110,000 and

there have been tensions between the established Jewish Community who identified as ethnically and religiously Jewish and the immigrant community who only ethnically identified as Jewish.

With growing immigration from the Arab region and Turkey, Germany is facing a political challenge. It has a special relationship with Israel that may be changed by a new connection to the Middle East created by new waves of immigration. There is a challenge to the Jewish community to explain the role and actions of Israel to the new Arab and Turkish migrants. It is also important to work with this group of migrant children of migrants combat any anti-Semitism. The Central Council of Jews to Germany is generally pro-foreigners. While, there is not an explicit culture of lobbying in Germany, the Council is vocal and has an effect on political discourse, disproportionate to their numbers. In general, the community is attempting to create an alliance with the Turkish community, in an effort toward liberalizing society.

Undocumented Migration and Return

MLC participants examined undocumented migration during a discussion with Andreas Halback, German Mission of the International Organisation for Migration, Stefan Keßler, Jesuit Refugee Service in Germany, and Angelica Salas, Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles. Key points included:

- Unauthorized migration is a problem in Europe and the EU has become increasingly involved in shaping migration policy. However, migration policy is still essentially regulated by the nation state.
- The undocumented status of migrants refers to entry into the state, employment, and residency without the proper documentation. In Germany, public debate focuses on controlling entry, the rights based approach, and whether minimum rights should be guaranteed to the undocumented.
- There may be as many as one million undocumented in Germany. In general, there was an increase in the number of migrants in the 1990s, following the break up of the Soviet Union.
- The UN Convention on Migrant Workers has only been ratified by sending countries. In Germany, the law enforcement tradition is quite strong and the undocumented are viewed as illegal. Regularization and amnesties occur in some other EU countries, but in Germany this is considered unacceptable.
- Deportations from Germany are substantial. It is important to encourage voluntary return and remigration to deal with the problem of economic migrants, because if done correctly, it can have community benefits to the sending country. While pursuing a just return policy, governments should ensure that they are encouraging developing work in sending countries so that individuals to not migrate to receive the migration grant. In Germany, "voluntary returns" exceed 6,000 people a year (carried out by IOM); forced returns are higher.
- Countries have provided very limited means for certain groups to come legally and this has created the undocumented population. In the United States, it takes 14 to 15

years for Mexicans to come legally and it takes up to 23 years for someone from the Philippines to come legally. Those who are legal can fall out of legal status.

- Legalization movements tend to require a lot of political will. Current US policy proposals institute mostly punitive measures related to legalization, where individuals will be prevented from gaining citizenship immediately if they are unauthorized. In the United States, there are approximately 12 million undocumented and three million of those are children. The undocumented face social persecution, workplace exploitation, low wages, no access to healthcare, no chance at higher education, hate crimes, and no political representation.
- Most US NGOs approach the undocumented through community outreach and advocacy. NGOs are reaching out to the undocumented where they are and engaging in campaigns to inform them of their rights. The US NGO community believes participation and mobilization of the undocumented is the key to influencing politicians. The US advocacy model is to advocate with the undocumented and not for the undocumented. Coalitions are formed across sectors, including business and religious groups. NGOs advocate for backlogs, workers rights, civil rights, civil liberties, and legalization.
- In Europe, the undocumented are invisible to policymakers; the focus is on preventive entry and return. The undocumented have problems accessing social services and there are systematic violations of their human rights.

German Immigration Law in the Eyes of Policymakers

Omid Nouripour, Member of Parliament, Green Party; Heike Marquardt, Commissioner for Migrant and Integration Affairs, Berlin-Lichtenberg; and Chung-Wha Hong, New York Immigration Coalition, discussed the reformed Immigration Act which went into force on 1 January 2005 in Germany , following a long and difficult legislative process and intense discussions in public and in the Bundestag. Key points from the discussion included:

- The Immigration Act provides a legislative framework for controlling and restricting immigration as a whole and also contains measures to promote the integration of legal immigrants in Germany.
- The first attempt at crafting migration policy in Germany was stopped in 2001 by the German Supreme Court; the second attempt passed after negotiations with conservatives. Some in the German society, particularly the far right, are interested in limiting immigration to Germany to protect the German identity. The 2004 Madrid bombings sparked the security debate in Germany.
- The law included an education/language program, requiring 600 hours of German language instruction and 30 hours of German culture orientation. There has been tension between the local and federal governments over the classes and funding for the program, which is mostly funded by the federal government. Problems have included too much bureaucracy; insufficient spaces for students; too many requirements for teachers; and not enough qualified teachers. The cultural orientation classes do not seem to be working because they are overly centralized and 30 hours is not enough to provide a complete orientation.

- Germany does not have strong immigrant organizations to advocate for immigrants and to fight the anti-immigrant movement. For example, prominent Turkish organizations have not cooperated with each other and other migrant organizations. Similarly, most individual immigrants do not feel empowered or trusted.
- On a community level, there are increasing percentages of foreign groups in some neighborhoods. Integration efforts at the local level include: youth clubs; private language courses; intercultural week; bringing together community members (both migrant and non-migrant) to protest when violence has occurred against the migrant community; and creating a council of migrants (where the majority are migrants).
- In the United States, the government has not taken the first step to recognize that integration needs to be addressed by national legislation. A formal definition and structural component for integration is missing. The policy framework needs to make sure integration is always part of immigration discussion.

Reflections and Feedback (Germany)

Will Somerville, Senior Policy Analyst, Migration Policy Institute, provided an overview session on some of the key findings from the group's time in Berlin, Germany.

- In European countries, there are different requirements for citizenship and integration, though this may converge. For example, in Germany, the focus is on language, where in the United Kingdom, the focus is on broader citizenship values.
- When looking at the undocumented, European civil society needs to examine if there is political space in the European Union for this discussion. Some countries are for example committed to regularisation policies; others implacably opposed.
- The situations of the undocumented youth in both Europe and the United States were linked. Both groups are suffering the consequences of becoming adults under a stigma of illegality.
- In Europe, there is a large amount of confusion about the identity of first, second, third generations of migrants and their relationship with ethnic identity and citizenship.
- Faith communities have a number of intra-community issues. Policymakers should examine how these communities work when trying to relate to them.
- The heterogeneity within migrant groups should be recognized when discussing policy or attempting to create dialogue with migrant groups.
- In Europe, there should be further engagement of the migrant community and more responsibility should be given to the migrant community rather than policy development led only by governments.

Migration in England

Brian Kearney Grieve, Atlantic Philanthropies, welcomed the group to London and to Tower Hamlets. Vaughan Jones, Praxis, welcomed the group to Praxis, and NGO housed in a church building, built in 1520 by the Calvinists. Praxis works with the first generation migrants in East London, providing advice, education, and counseling work.

Additionally, the organization coordinates work with Médecins du Monde and supplementary education programs.

Overview of British Immigration

Sarah Spencer, Centre on Migration Policy and Society, University of Oxford and the Equality and Diversity Forum, provided an overview of migration in England.

The history of migration in Britain tends to always start after WWII, but immigration began much earlier. In the 16th and 17th century, Britain was involved in trade and slavery and additionally accepted some refugee populations. However, up until 1990, Britain was country of emigration rather than immigration.

Migration in Britain is function of Empire. Populations in British colonies were told that they were British and there was recruitment for economic migrants from the Caribbean and India after WWII. This economic migration gave rise to social tensions. As the economy needed fewer people, the restrictions toward migrants increased. Exceptions to these restrictions are the Irish Free Travel Area and White Commonwealth (including Australia, New Zealand, Canada), and now the European Union.

In 1990s, the British economy was missing skilled labor and so managed labor migration policies were introduced. Legal channels for temporary low skilled labor migration were also introduced, but temporary migrants did not return home. In 2004, the need for low-skilled labor and problems associated with it, such as irregular migrants, were solved by the flow of workers from the Eastern European countries. The government has made a decision to not allow free movement for Romanians and Bulgarians and to stop the entry of third country nationals.

1.2 million people enter into Britain each week, and there is continuing debate about monitoring departure. Student entries are the largest, and work permit entries are rising. Family immigration is steady. Asylum numbers have fallen. Many of the illegal entrants are visa over-stayers.

Some skill based migrants to Britain are very well educated and some are not. Many of Britain's healthcare professionals and teachers are born overseas. Migrants overall pay more in taxes than they require in services. There is an increasing diversity.

There has been no national reception or integration strategy with exception of policies for refugees. When measuring outcomes of migrant integration, not all migrants are disproportionately disadvantaged; some are outperforming natives of the UK (race white) in education and employment and ethnic minorities hold positions of power. However there are those who are disadvantaged and face discrimination; while there is strong return for migrants' human capital, there is still a discrimination penalty, as over performers are still not getting fully paid.

The policy focus in Britain is on ethnic minorities not migrants, and on fighting discrimination through a multicultural approach, where value is placed on diversity. The multicultural approach has been criticized as a political barrier to bringing together minorities and migrants. In 2000, legislation was passed that put the onus on public employers and service providers to examine for racism and provide an action plan. Since 2003, because of the EU directive, the ban has been extended to religious discrimination.

Disturbances in 2001 revealed that antidiscrimination laws had not solved the problem and there was still the need for cohesion. Accordingly, the government focus changed from antidiscrimination to social cohesion.

There is a growing network focusing on unauthorized migrants. Foundations and charities such as the Barrow Cadbury Trust and the Joint Council for the Welfare of Immigrants (JCWI), trade unions and key politicians have worked together.

Exploring Pathways to Integration

Sarah Spencer moderated three panels on discussing the multiple pathways to immigrant integration.

Education Panel

John Akker, Council for Assisting Refugee Academics, and Paul Morrish, Resource Unit for Supplementary and Mother Tongue Schools discussed integration efforts through education. Highlights of their presentations and discussion included:

- In London, there are 300 languages spoken and one in three in the population is from an ethnic community
- Supplementary schools are minority community education projects run by parents and the community; the majority is black African. They are run on a voluntary basis or with a small budget. Operating on Saturday or after school, they focus on teaching English, Math, Science, and the community language, as well as about the community's history and faith.
- The Resource Unit has worked in London for seven years assisting supplementary schools from a variety of nationalities. They are conducting embedded research and learning at the schools, engaging with communities to find local barriers; working with schools to see what is needed; and whether the supplementary schools will provide the education that is needed. There is no exact count of the number of schools, but it may be as high as 8,000 and the sector is growing.
- No formal studies have been done, but the schools, in addition to tutoring, may provide: enhanced attainment; improved behavior; alternative curriculum not always allowed by the prescribed by national curriculum; family and community learning; health improvement; parent engagement in their child's education; and community cohesion.
- There are no standards for these schools and funding is minimal, so they range in effectiveness. Studies on supplementary schools have demonstrated improvements for

previously underperforming students in tests scores, homework completion, increased school attendance, increased parental involvement, and increased scoring in at least one core curriculum subject.

- CARA works as part of the education process, and views education as an important factor in the integration process.
- Challenges for Immigrants and Refugees integrating into society include: low skilled and low attainment backgrounds; gender/race bias; housing access; language barriers; learning social mores; access to specialist advice and access to providers; and engagement of the support of the host community.
- CARA works to overcome challenges by assisting refugee students and academics to obtain jobs and get into schools by providing them with needed skills and economic support.
- CARA is also interested in providing decent language education, linking groups with employment, specialist advice, and educational access. Future proof of capability and skills is needed to justify education and education is needed to cultivate the skills. CARA also works to ensure there is not abuse and exploitation. Some migrants and refugees might face exploitation.
- The key to successful integration is education. In an effort to open up and sensitize higher education to the needs of refugees, CARA has given grants to universities so that they can consider needs of migrants.

Housing Panel

Heather Petch, HACT, and Azim El Hassan, Independent Consultant, presented on housing programs for migrants.

- HACT was created to attack direct discrimination in 1950s and in the 1970s, HACT worked mostly with black minority groups. HACT supplies housing solutions for people on the margins by developing sustainable partnerships and networks, funding and promoting practical solutions for social inclusion, and sharing insights, outcomes, and replicable models. HACT works to overcome problems such as housing supply, access, and neighborhoods.
- The supply of social housing is critical for new communities. There is a shortage of housing where migrants work and the problem is especially acute in Southeast England and London. Out of the housing stock most migrants are dependent upon, half has been declared unfit.
- Access to housing is limited by low incomes and inadequate advocacy and information. Migrant neighborhoods often have high concentrations of poverty. Community safety, shared space, cohesion, and integration are all issues.
- Challenges that migrants and refugees face when attempting to obtain housing include: restricted access to public services for refugees and migrants; enforced dispersal of asylum seekers across the United Kingdom; mismatch between employment needs in an area and housing policy; and severe housing supply constraints in buoyant economic areas, which cause overcrowding and destitution.

- Steps have been made in refugee and migrant housing by empowering community groups; building capacity; brokering partnerships and networks (including between the margins and mainstream); linking different communities – new and longer term residents; and using word of mouth in the community to advertise options and suggestions on how to deal with housing authorities.

Employment Panel

Patrick Wintour, Employability Forum, and Kate Roberts, Kalayaan, explained their work in the area of employment strategies for migrants.

- Kayalan is a small UK based charity established in 1987 to organize workers. Kayalan works with migrant domestic workers, advocating for rights, entitlements, and protections granted to them by their visa. Kayalan works as an advocate by engaging in public information campaigns and policy work. The organization also provides ESOL and exercise classes and provides housing information.
- Often, Migrant Domestic Workers are unaware of their rights; and the nature of their workplace (the home) creates a hidden environment where abuse can easily take place. Kayalan reports migrants who have been physically, psychologically, and sexual abused; not given enough food; locked in the house; and not provided a private room. Thirty two percent also report employers retaining the MDWs passport and immigration documents, preventing them from leaving; or refusing renewal of their visa unless they have their original visa. Furthermore, workers who do leave abusive situations often have nowhere to go. Kayalan supports the worker and assists them if they complain to the police or about wage issues.
- Institutional barriers faced by workers include: authorities that focus on the worker's immigration status before their rights; no recourse to public assistance funds; and there is lack of information and guidance for MDWs.
- Similar to other advocacy organizations, Kayalan faces capacity problems when creating an intensive media campaign, since much of their focus is on direct advice to MDWs. In an effort to involve MDWs directly in the work, Kayalan has five domestic workers on their management committee. They also hold informational meetings to inform workers about the campaign and how they can get involved.

- The Employability Forum provides refugee project-based services including: caseworkers, mentors, advice for refugee professionals, and support for refugee community organizations.
- The Employability Forum also focuses on employer engagement, voluntary sector and government partnership, English language education, and refugee professionals.

Introduction to the Work of the Supplier Diversity Europe Project

Beth Ginsburg from Supplier Diversity, Migration Policy Group (MPG) spoke about the program.

- Supplier diversity works to provide under represented businesses, including but not limited to businesses, owned by immigrants, women, and people of color with the same opportunity to compete for the supply of quality goods and services as other suppliers.
- The argument that these businesses have been left out of the bidding process is a new one in Europe. MPG convinced big businesses to participate in the project by pointing out how the program fits with the corporate social responsibility program.
- Underrepresented minority businesses are 7% of the businesses in the United Kingdom and are the fastest growing. Multinationals were saying that they did not have access to where these businesses were, and so MPG created database of ethnic business.
- MPG has found that this program has strengthened the networks between migrant owned businesses and MPG is trying to further this network by creating a consortium of the companies.

Strengthening the Voice of Migrants

Moderated by Beth Ginsburg, Supplier Diversity Europe Project, Migration Policy Group, this panel explored the topics of developing the leadership and capacity of migrant organizations, creating coalitions among migrant groups, funding migrant led activities, and increasing the impact of migrant organizations.

Speakers included Tzeggai Yohannes Deres, Evelyn Oldfield Unit; Don Flynn, Migrant Rights Network; Bharat Mehta, City Parochial Foundation; Kerim Yildiz, Kurdish Human Rights Project; and Gustavo Torres, CASA de Maryland. There was also a presentation by Vaughan Jones, Director of Praxis.

- There are established mechanisms and procedures that allow groups to obtain access to services. For example, training courses with different universities allow organization leaders to further their education and build their capacity; consultants can provide feedback and different organizational development strategies, including information on how to work with the government; and leadership programs can be developed with national support of government and civil service college courses provide education along with access to certain networks.
- Migrant voices are found in established welfare and cultural organizations, refugee community organizations, informal mutual aid networks, migrant interest networks in trade unions, government, faith groups, and media; and civil society in general.
- Migrant voices focus on concrete and practical issues, are influenced by the regional and specific cities' political and cultural issues, flourish within cities and regions, but generally not across cities and regions, and are most effective on working with public authorities and public services on matters concerning the immediate interests of the community.
- Migrants have been most successful in working on settlement/dispersal issues, serving as gateways to others in the community, and working with other civil society organizations on issues of mutual concern.

- Migrant voices should build capacity by bridging activities, establishing common agendas between different migrant groups on specific issues, building networking between cities and regions, increasing their representation in national policy formulation and debates. In order to effectively campaign, a campaign should not be started unless there is a 50% chance of winning, is based on concrete experiences and priorities established by migrant communities; it can build upon grassroots agendas rather than imposing a new agenda for grassroots organizations; and there are clear objectives for lobbying activities within time limited periods.
- Foundations are sometimes limited in the funding they can provide to groups who work with the undocumented. If a group of foundations can work together to fund work on this issue, it is easier to continue the work, because there is shared responsibility.
- The Kurdish Human Rights Project works to find a mechanism for individuals in the community to express their viewpoints. The group works with the established Kurdish community and diaspora to raise the awareness about the psychological and social problems of newly arriving Kurds and of the human rights abuses taking place where Kurds are settled. The Kurdish diaspora has been able to address the legal needs of some Kurdish migrants and stop human rights abuses in areas where Kurdish communities are, by finding legal communities that can provide pro-bono representation.
- A community organization should always make sure that the community is "at the table" and private foundations should make sure the community organizations they fund have community at the table.
- Praxis is a community group that works with people and their realities. Praxis believes that migration is the movement of people and people matter; when dealing with migrants, there needs to be a consistency of values.
- The framework for community change includes working for change and working for the empowerment of communities. There is a need to broaden and refresh thinking around cohesion and integration. The challenge is to combine integration and security and the development and migration processes, all while meeting the needs of migrants.

Keynote: Mohammed Aziz, Faithwise: Muslims in Europe and North America—A New Way Forward

There are similarities and many differences between the United Kingdom, European, and US Muslim communities. The differences are in Muslim migration, settlement, socioeconomic, and integration patterns.

The geographic spread in the United Kingdom is similar to Europe, with settlements around the major cities. Muslims are a diverse group, including Pakistani, Bangladeshi, Indian, other Asian groups, Arab, Turkish-Cyprian, Eastern European, and other White, black Africans and Caribbean, as well as converts.

Hate crimes are an old issue in Europe. Islamophobia can be traced throughout European/ British history. It goes back to the Eras of the Crusades, Imperialism, and Orientalism.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall, there was a return to the idea of an old enemy. There has been an increase in prejudice, hatred and hostility since 9/11, 3/11, and 7/7. There has also been a decrease in the ability to access employment and services. There have also been community cohesion implications. In response to hate crimes, the Muslim community has made a successful push to obtain legal protection.

Direct Islamophobic discrimination is when an individual is discriminated against with intent on the grounds of religion. Disadvantaged (without intent) on the ground of religions is also a problem. There is EU legislation to protect against both types of discrimination. Institutional Discrimination is not always felt by discriminator or those discriminated against, but statistical analysis reveal clear patterns of discrimination. The only way it is evident is by looking at statistical trends over time. Tools to tackle discrimination include positive duty, PSA's regulatory/audit bodies, and procurement provisions. Entrenched disadvantage affects education, employment, housing, and health.

Meta narratives are national stories about the British people—their characteristics and values—by powerful public figures that negatively impact the British Muslim community. For example after the Madrid bombings, Dennis McShane, a senior politician, said that Muslims must choose between our civilized norms and their terrorist ways.

Islam and Muslims have a contribution to make to the future of Britain and the West. The Islamic experience is similar to problems faced by Jewish, Free Churches, and Catholics less than a hundred years ago. The central values of Islam are not dissimilar from those of secular western societies. There is a wealth of information under Muslim writings on how to live in relative harmony.

Muslims are a very young group, in Britain, amongst a hugely aging population. They are also a group that knows the culture and should be encouraged to be future social, political, and cultural actors, and act as diplomats in business and foreign relations. They speak every language and are part of almost every culture; and should be utilized as a resource.

Muslims can have a role in stability and peace. Atrocities also affect Muslims.

Muslim leadership appropriate for the 21st century multicultural society should be developed. This means leadership not just in skills set, but a leadership capable of rethinking the universal principles and values of Islam for Britain and the West. The community needs a new set of self help institutions, advocacy groups, research bodies, and think tanks.

Citizenship should incorporate the concept of citizenship in Muslim heritage. A model of citizenship that reflects people’s multiple identities and allegiances and finds strength in its ability to accommodate each of them and to hold them together should be developed.

Human rights and equality also need to be addressed. It is important to eliminate discrimination against Muslims and promote equality of treatment, opportunities, and

outcomes between Muslims and other members of society. It is important to develop a model of integration that recognizes our society is constantly changing; that integration is a two way process between majority and minority cultures; that places this recognition at the heart of an evolving national identity toward a Greater Britain, Europe, and North America. It is important to promote mutual understanding and bonding and increase the relationship between Muslims and wider society. There should be a recognition that communities and cultures are changing and identities have to change.

The Muslim Youth Helpline was founded by a group of 16 year olds. The organization was founded in an effort to respond to young people who were marginalized and isolated. Common youth issues were considered taboo by the Muslim community, and Muslim youth felt it was hard to get help with these issues in the Muslim community, and there was a feeling that British Service Providers could not always be culturally sensitive and this was a barrier to them providing service. The core services offered by the helpline are free phone, email, and face to face counseling.

Muslim youth have very complicated, multifaceted identities. Age, global and political issues, gender, and religion all factor into their identity. There is very little about their identity that is not challenged. There are very few spaces in the community where they can challenge ideas in their community. Many youths are forced to prove that they are more British than Muslim. However, many Muslims are quite comfortable straddling both worlds, and many see it as something quite enriching. The problem arises when they are forced to choose between the two worlds.

Muslim youth face the same problems as other youth, but Muslim Youth.net is able to provide empathy of experience, which is something that mainstream service providers can not always provide. The organization makes recommendations to both mainstream providers and to Muslim youth. Building bridges of understanding is crucial to the work of mainstream providers and to the Muslim youth community.

Both the United States and Europe are facing the rise of anti-terrorism laws. There is an increase in hate crimes against Muslim individuals, businesses, and Mosques. There are the negative narratives that emerge in society. However, in the United States, there is a sense that there is a place for all. One person is entitled to all the same rights as everyone else. Within the Western World, there is a real difference as to what freedom means. In the United States, the headscarf is not as contentious as it is in Europe. This may be traced back to the notion that the founders came to the United States to escape religious persecution and were searching for religious freedom. In the United States, people are not forced to make a choice between the United States and their religion.

CLOSING REMARKS

END OF TOUR

ANNEX B: LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Participants 12-18 November 2006

1. Les Allamby	*Law Centre, Northern Ireland*
2. Nathalie Caprioli	*Centre Bruxellois d'Action Interculturelle - CBAI (Brussels Center for Intercultural Action)*
3. Dimitria Denise Clayton	*State of North Rhine-Westphalia, Germany*
4. Catherine Cosgrave	*Immigrant Council of Ireland*
5. Katrien De Bruyn	*OCIV - Vluchtelingenwerk Vlaanderen (the Flemish Refugee Council)*
6. Pieter De Gryse	*OCIV - Vluchtelingenwerk Vlaanderen (the Flemish Refugee Council)*
7. Alison De Lucca	*Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees*
8. Lisa Dixon	*Migration Policy Institute*
9. Susan Downs-Karkos	*The Colorado Trust*
10. Fernando Garcia	*Border Network for Human Rights*
11. Leceia Gordon-Mackenzie	*Migration Policy Group*
12. Alison Harker	*Independent Consultant*
13. Jacqueline Healy	*Migrant Rights Centre Ireland*
14. Taryn Higashi	*Ford Foundation*
15. Chung-Wha Hong	*New York Immigration Coalition*
16. Joshua W. Hoyt	*Illinois Coalition for Immigrant and Refugee Rights*
17. Andreas Jacobs	*Konrad-Adenauer Foundation*
18. Pramila Jayapal	*Hate Free Zone*
19. Barbara John	*Former Commissioner for Migration and*

	Integration, Berlin Senate
20. Brian Kearney-Grieve	*Atlantic Philanthropies – Ireland*
21. Donald Kerwin	*Catholic Legal Immigration Network*
22. Farhana Khera	*Muslim Advocates*
23. Ngoan Le	*Chicago Community Trust*
24. Michele LeVoy	*Platform for International Cooperation on Undocumented Migrants*
25. David Lubell	*Tennessee Immigrant and Refugee Rights Coalition*
26. Heike Marquardt	*Commissioner for Migrants and Integration*
27. Frédérique Mawet	*Coordination et Initiatives pour Réfugiés et Etrangers*
28. Bernadette McAliskey	*South Tyrone Empowerment Programme*
29. Milena Novy-Marx	*The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*
30. Christopher Oliha	*Flemish Forum for Minorities*
31. Peter O'Mahony	*Irish Refugee Council*
32. Demetrios G. Papademetriou	*Migration Policy Institute*
33. Daranee Petsod	*Grantmakers Concerned with Immigrants and Refugees*
34. Françoise Pissart	*King Baudouin Foundation*
35. René Plaetevoet	*December 18*
36. Maria Teresa Rojas	*Open Society Institute*
37. Angelica Salas	*Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles*
38. John Slocum	*The John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation*

39. Will Somerville	*Migration Policy Institute*
40. Eoghan Stack	*The One Foundation*
41. Aki Stavrou	*Integrating Ireland*
42. Linnet Taylor	*The Rockefeller Foundation*
43. Gustavo Torres	*CASA of Maryland*
44. Jacob van Garderen	*Lawyers for Human Rights*
45. Nele Verbruggen	*King Baudouin Foundation*
46. Joe Wismann-Horther	*Spring Institute for Intercultural Learning* *Supporting Immigrant and Refugee Families Iniative - Immigrant Integration*
47. Tanja Wunderlich	*The German Marshall Fund of the United States*
48. Marianne Yang	*New York State Defenders Association - Immigrant Defense Project*
49. Astried Ziebarth	*The German Marshall Fund of the United States*